

## STUDIES IN THE PĀLI GRAMMARIANS

### II.1

- [A] Buddhaghosa on *itthambhūtakḥhyāna*, *itthambhūtalakkhaṇa*, *accanta-samyoga*, *adhikaraṇa*, *bhāvalakkhaṇa*, *kaṇa*, *nimitta*, and *samīpa*.  
[B] Grammatical References in Paramatthajotikā I–II.  
[C] Mahānāma and Buddhadatta on Grammar.

### Introduction

In Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I<sup>1</sup> I have shown that whenever Buddhaghosa refers to grammar or grammarians in support of his analysis of a grammatical or semantical problem in the Pāli, he is referring to Pāṇinian grammar. This apparently is also the case in those instances where he deals with a number of syntactical problems, without mentioning the source upon which his analysis is based. These analyses constitute a valuable complement to those I have dealt with in the previous article, and I have therefore found it worthwhile to focus on them in this paper, so as to present a more complete picture of Buddhaghosa as a grammarian. Since almost all of the examples occur in identical form in his Aṭṭhakathās, I have taken Samantapāsādikā as the primary source, being historically the first among the commentaries allegedly written by Buddhaghosa. In addition, I have dealt with a number of interesting grammatical comments found in Paramatthajotikā I–II, which are both traditionally ascribed to Buddhaghosa, although his authorship has been disputed.<sup>2</sup> In each case it has been possible to identify the source as Pāṇinian grammar.

Although the majority of grammatical references in the Pāli. Aṭṭhakathās are found in the writings attributed to Buddhaghosa, he is not the only Buddhist Pāli scholar who occasionally focuses on topics of grammatical interest. In Mahānāma's and Buddhadatta's commentaries on

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I, *JPTS* 1989 pp. 33–81.

<sup>2</sup> They are probably both post-Buddhaghosa, but historically they cannot be far removed in time from him. Whoever was the actual author of these two Aṭṭhakathās [for a discussion of this problem, cf. Norman, *Pāli Literature*, p. 129], internal evidence shows beyond doubt that they were written by the same person since there are several references in Pj II to topics which the author intends to deal with in detail in Pj I [cf., for example, Pj II 136,20: *ayam ettha saṃkhepo, vitthāraṃ pana Maṅgalasuttavaṇṇanāyaṃ* (= Pj I 111,6 foll.) *vakkhāma*]; consequently Pj II must have been written first.

Paṭisambidhāmagga and Buddhavaṃsa, respectively, we come across a number of similar references. Since both authors belong to the post-Buddhaghosa generation of Pāli scholars, I have for historical reasons found it interesting to study these references in order to decide whether one can trace, through their grammatical comments, a development toward a distinctively Buddhist Pāli grammatical tradition.

Mahānāma [first half of the 6th century A.D.]<sup>3</sup> and Buddhadatta [8th century A.D. ?]<sup>4</sup> apparently follow Buddhaghosa's example by taking Pāṇinian grammar as their main reference grammar, but in a few interesting cases they deviate from the strict Pāṇinian tradition.

Mahānāma rarely discusses questions of grammar. There are, in fact, only four grammatical references in Paṭis-a, but all of them are interesting.<sup>5</sup> One of them is found in his commentary on the Suññakathā [= Paṭis II 177–84]. Commenting upon the meaning of the word “empty” (*suñña*), Mahānāma not only refers to grammar (*Saddagantha*), but also to *pramāṇavāda* (*Ñāyagantha*). Since this text raises a number of questions that are only remotely connected with the rise of the Pāli grammatical tradition, I have found it appropriate to deal with this text in a separate paper.<sup>6</sup> Another reference seems to indicate that Mahānāma may well have been acquainted with another grammatical source in addition to Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī. If so, his source is no doubt identical with Candravyākaraṇa.

In contrast to Mahānāma, Buddhadatta refers more often to the rules of grammar (*lakkaṇa*). Although his grammatical statements ultimately would seem to derive from Pāṇinian grammar, it is nonetheless clear that in a few cases they reflect a distinctively Buddhist grammatical tradition. This, for instance, is evident in the case where Buddhadatta lays out alternative ways of analysing the word “*Buddha*”. There are indications that his source may

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Norman, *Pāli Lit.*, p. 132.

<sup>4</sup> The date of Buddhadatta has not yet been fixed definitively. He may belong to the period after Dhammapāla, to whose Vv-a he appears to refer. Cf. Norman, *Pāli Lit.*, p. 146.

<sup>5</sup> The reference to *saddavidū* at Paṭis-a 645,3 [qu. Nidd-a 293,22] is not a genuine grammatical reference like some of those found in Buddhaghosa's writings [cf. *Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I*], being a mere gloss on the term *mahaddhano*. It has not been possible to identify Mahānāma's source, but it is probably not wrong to assume that he draws his information from a Pāli *kośa*. The passage reads: *dhanavā ti pasamsitabbapaññāddhanavattā niccayuttapaññāddhanavattā atisayabhūtapaññāddhanavattā dhanavā. etesu tisu atthesu idam vacanam saddavidū icchanti*. In one place [v. Paṭis-a 569,19] he deals with a grammatical problem: the interpretation of the compound *vimokkhamukka*, which he interprets as a *karmadhāraya*, without referring to any grammatical source.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Mahānāma on the Interpretation of Emptiness (forthcoming).

have been identical with Kaccāyana's grammar and the commentarial tradition attached to it. The nature of the grammatical references that occur in the post-Buddhaghosa Pāli. Aṭṭhakathās would thus seem to reflect a wider variety of sources and influences than in the case of Buddhaghosa's grammatical comments.

## [ A ]

### 1.1 *itthambhūtakkhyāna* [Sp 111,30–112,3 ad Vin III 1,12–13]

Buddhaghosa only uses the term *itthambhūtakkhyāna* sparingly and almost always in similar contexts. In Sp it occurs twice, the first time in connection with his exegesis of Vin III 1,12–13:

*taṃ kho pana bhagavantam Gotamaṃ evaṃ kalyāṇo kittisaddo abbhuggato: ...*

However, as regards him, the Lord Gotama, the highest praise (*kalyāṇo kittisaddo*) was spread (*abbhuggato*) in the following words (*evaṃ*): ...

On this clause Buddhaghosa writes the following comment:

*taṃ kho panā ti itthambhūtakkhyānatthe upayogavacanam: tassa kho pana bhoṭo Gotamassā ti attho.*<sup>7</sup>

[In the clause] “however, as regards him, [etc.]” the accusative is used in the sense of a statement of circumstance. The meaning is “however, with respect to him, the lord Gotama.”

The question with which Buddhaghosa deals here is the function of the preposition *abhi* [in *abbhuggata*] when it is used as a *karmapravacanīya* [= Pāli *kammavacanīya*],<sup>8</sup> i.e., a preposition used independently of an

<sup>7</sup> For identical analyses, cf. Ps II 327,34 (ad M I 285,8); Mp II 286,22 (ad A I 180,20); Pj II 441,2 (ad Sn 103,6).

<sup>8</sup> For this technical term, cf. Renou, *Terminologie*, s.v.

explicit verb form, which is to be complemented from the context. Pāṇini deals with these particles in Pāṇ I 4 83 foll. In Pāṇ I 4 [90+] 91, which is the sūtra Buddhaghosa has in mind, he describes the function of *abhi* as a *karmapravacanīya*: *abhir abhāge*: “*abhi*” [is a *karmapravacanīya* used in the sense of a sign (i.e., “in the direction of”), a statement of circumstance (i.e., “as regards; with respect to”), and of distribution (i.e., “separately; one after another”)] but not in the sense of division.

According to Pāṇini such *karmapravacanīyas* are regularly constructed with the accusative [cf. Pāṇ II 3 8: *karmapravacanīyayukte dvitīyā*]. In Pāli the usage differs from Sanskrit since *abbhuggacchati* is constructed both with acc. and gen. in analogous contexts [v. CPD s.v. *abbhuggacchati*]. The construction with the gen. is no doubt reflected in Buddhaghosa’s paraphrase, which in addition conveys the particular semantic value of *abhi* when used in the sense of *itthambhūtakkhyāna*.<sup>9</sup>

It is, of course, questionable whether the Pāṇinian description of the category of *karmapravacanīya* is applicable to Pāli *abbhuggacchati* as suggested by Buddhaghosa. As a matter of fact, there is no clear case of a *karmapravacanīya* in Pāli. The verb *abbhuggacchati* is rather to be interpreted as a regular verbal compound with two *upasargas*, as indicated by the *sandhi*. The particle *abhi* therefore has no independent syntactical function in the same way that a *karmapravacanīya* is supposed to have according to the Pāṇinian definition. That which suggested to Buddhaghosa to interpret *abhi* as a *karmapravacanīya* and to take it in the sense of *itthambhūtakkhyāna* was no doubt the fact that in this particular case, which represents an old canonical stereotype, the verb *abbhuggacchati* is constructed with the acc. However, as mentioned before, there are several instances in canonical Pāli where it is constructed with the gen. This shows clearly that we are dealing with a regularly compounded verb that optionally may be constructed with the acc. or the gen. This represents a peculiarity of the Pāli, for which there is no parallel in Sanskrit. It is therefore justified to conclude that the linguistic category of *karmapravacanīya* in its Pāṇinian form is obsolete in Pāli.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Buddhaghosa apparently never comments upon those instances where *abbhuggacchati* is constructed with the genitive. This situation is typical of the way in which he applies his knowledge of Sanskrit grammar to clarify grammatical features of the Pāli: he seems to consciously avoid dealing with those instances which contradict Sanskrit usage as defined by Pāṇini.

<sup>10</sup> For an analogous example of the usage of the category of *karmapravacanīya* for exegetical purposes, cf. Buddhadatta’s analysis of *anupabajjati* ad Bv XX 5, q.v. infra.

Both Vjb [Be 1960 38,4–7] and Sp-ṭ [Be 1960 I 214,19–215,11] comment upon Buddhaghosa’s explanation. Sāriputta’s lengthy exegesis in Sp-ṭ, which he illustrates with examples quoted from either Candravṛtti ad Candra II 1 54 or the Kāśikā ad Pāṇ I 4 91, displays his usual mastery of grammatical issues and thus confirms the Pāṇinian background of Buddhaghosa’s analysis.<sup>11</sup> Kacc-v ad Kacc 301 [= Sadd 586] quotes the example upon which Buddhaghosa comments, and adds another example taken from D II 30,11: *pabbajitaṃ anu pabbajimsu*, that is analogous to the clauses at Bv II 47 and Bv XX 5, with which Buddhadatta deals in his commentary ad loc. [v. infra].

[Sp 622,11-12 ad Vin III 181,3-4]

Buddhaghosa’s reference to *itthambhūtakkhyāna* in this case is clearly a slip of the pen for *itthambhūtalakkhaṇa* [on which v. infra], which the context shows that he must have had in mind. This assumption is confirmed by the fact that in Sp he defines a similar usage, with reference to *itthambhūtalakkhaṇa*.<sup>12</sup> The syntactical problem with which he deals in his comment is a series of instrumental forms that occur in the following sentence: *atha kho so bhikkhu ... Kiṭṭāgirim piṇḍāya pāvīsi pāsādikena abhikkantena paṭikantena ālokitena vilokitena sammāñjitena pasāritena okkhittacakkhu iriyāpathasampanno*. After having commented on the meaning of each instrumental form, he concludes: *sabbattha itthambhūtakkhyānathe karaṇavacanāṃ*: in all [the above-mentioned cases] the instrumental is used in the sense of a statement of circumstances [correct

<sup>11</sup> Because of its intrinsic interest I quote the relevant part of Sāriputta’s ṭīkā: “*itthambhūtakkhyānathe upayogavacananāṃ ti itthaṃ imaṃ pakāraṃ bhūto āpanno to itthambhūto. tassākkhyānaṃ itthambhūtakkhyānaṃ so yeva attho itthambhūtakkhyānattho. athavā itthaṃ evaṃ pakāro bhūto jāto ti evaṃ kathanattho itthambhūtakkhyānattho. tasmim upayogavacananāṃ ti attho. ettha ca “abbhuggato” ti ettha abhisaddo itthambhūtakkhyānatthajotako abhūbhavitvā uggamanappakāraṃ dipanato. tena yogato “taṃ kho pana bhavantaṃ Gotamaṃ” ti idaṃ upayogavacanaṃ sāmīatthe visamānaṃ itthambhūtakkhyānadīpanato itthambhūtakkhyānathe ti vuttaṃ. ten’ evāha: “tassa kho pana bhoto Gotamassā” ti attho ti. idaṃ vuttaṃ hoti: yathā sādhu Devadatto mātaram abhi [= sādhu Devadatta mātaram abhi, Candravṛtti ad Candra II 1 54 and Kāś ad Pāṇ I 4 91] ti attho abhisaddayogato itthambhūtakkhyāne upayogavacanaṃ kataṃ. evaṃ idhāpi taṃ kho pana bhavantaṃ gotamaṃ abhi evaṃ kalyāṇo kittisaddo uggato ti abhisaddayogato itthambhūtakkhyāne upayogavacananāṃ ti, Sp-ṭ I 214,19 foll.*

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Sp 974,31.

to read *itthambhūtalakkhaṇe*: in the sense of an indication of a particular state or condition].

Although the usage of the instr. case is clearly modal in this case, the very fact that we are dealing with instrumental forms excludes the existence of the category of *karmapravacanīya*, of which *itthambhūtākhyāna* is a subset, being constructed with the acc. The corresponding modal usage of the instrumental is denoted *itthambhūtalakṣaṇa* in Pāṇini's technical vocabulary [cf. Pāṇ II 3 21 and v. infra]. And this usage is the subject of the following discussion.

### 1.2 *itthambhūtalakkhana* [Sp 891,8-9 ad Vin IV 187,4]

In this example Buddhaghosa is concerned with a particular usage of the instrumental case. The vinaya text on which he comments is the following: *na ukkhittakāya antaraghare gamissāmī ti*: "I shall not walk between the houses with [the robe] lifted up," on which he writes the following concise comment:

*ukkhittakāyā ti ukkhepena, itthambhūtalakkhaṇe karaṇa-  
vacanam.*

[The expression] "with [the robe] lifted up" means "by lifting up [the robe]." The instrumental (*karaṇavacanam*) is used in the sense of an indication of [someone or something being in] this or that state or condition.

This exegesis presupposes Pāṇ II 3 [18+] 21 which gives a concise definition of the modal usage of the instrumental: *itthambhūtalakṣaṇe*: [The third case, i.e., the instrumental case] is used in the sense of an indication of [someone or something being in] this or that state or condition. Buddhaghosa's identification of this particular usage of the instrumental is precise and to the point because, from a syntactical point of view, there is complete agreement between Sanskrit and Pāli usage in this case.

### 1.3 *accantasamyoga* [Sp 107, 27-31 ad Vin III 1,6]

The technical term *accantasamyoga* is rarely found in Buddhaghosa's *Aṭṭhakathās*. It is, however, an inseparable part of his elaborate discussion — reproduced, with minor changes according to the context, in his commentaries on the nikāyas — of the case syntax and meaning of the word *samaya*, which throughout the canonical literature is used either in the accusative, the instrumental or the locative. In this context Buddhaghosa addresses the usage of *samaya* in the accusative. The relevant passage reads:

*kathaṃ suttante tāva accantasamyogatto sambhavati ? yaṃ  
hi samayaṃ bhagavā Brahmajālādīni suttantāni desesi  
accantam eva taṃ samayaṃ karuṇāvihārena vihāsi, tasmā  
tadatthajotanatthaṃ tattha upayoganiddeso kato.*<sup>13</sup>

How can it be that it is first of all (*tāva*) in the sutta(s) that the meaning of uninterrupted connection (*accantasamyoga*) [in time] occurs ? Because (*hi*) Bhagavan, during the time (*samayaṃ*) when he taught suttas such as Brahmajāla, uninterruptedly (*accantam*)<sup>14</sup> remained in a state of compassion, (*tasmā*) the specification [of circumstances] in them (*tattha*) is put (*kato*) in the accusative (*upayoganiddesa*) in order to make this meaning clear.

According to a quotation from the *porāṇas* [= *aṭṭhakathācariyās*] which Buddhaghosa invariably quotes in this context, it makes no difference if *samaya* is put in the acc., instr. or loc.<sup>15</sup> since the meaning is locatival in any case. There is therefore good cause to believe that Buddhaghosa's elaborate exegesis represents a later attempt to relate the usage of the word *samaya*, in acc., instr., and loc., to distinct syntactical categories as defined by Pāṇinian grammar, while at the same time attempting to interpret a purely grammatical problem in the context of Buddhist hermeneutics.

<sup>13</sup> The same text occurs also, with minor changes, at Sv I 33,23-25; Ps I 9,26-29; Spk I 11,28-31; Mp I 13,20-23.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Sp-ṭ Be 1903 I 188,5-7: *accantam evā ti ārambhato paṭṭhāya yāva desanāniṭṭhānam tāva accantam eva: nīrantaram evā ti*; Vjb Be 1960 34,26-27.

<sup>15</sup> For a translation of this quotation, v. Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I, p. 36.

It is, of course, not possible to decide whether Buddhaghosa himself is responsible for this attempt, or whether his analysis merely reflects contemporary Theravāda exegesis. In any case, the context in which the above passage occurs — it represents one of the most complex sections of Buddhaghosa's *Aṭṭhakathās* — displays considerable knowledge of Pāṇinian grammar.<sup>16</sup> For instance, his usage of the term *accantasamyoga* [= Sanskrit *atyantasamyoga*] for explaining the usage of *taṃ samayaṃ* is dependent on Pāṇ II 3 [2+] 5, which defines this particular usage of the acc. as follows: *kālādhvanor atyantasamyoge*: [The second case, i.e., the acc. is used] after [words expressing] temporal or spatial extension, when [the sense is] uninterrupted connection [in time or space].

#### 1.4 *adhikaraṇa* and *bhāvalakkhaṇa* [Sp 107,31–108,5 ad Vin III 1,6]

This text is, like the one analysed above [v. supra 1.3], part of Buddhaghosa's exegesis of the syntax of the word *samaya*. This time he deals with the locative:

*Abhidhamme ca adhikaraṇattho bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇattho ca sambhavati. [so punctuate] adhikaraṇaṃ hi kālattho samūhattho ca samayo tattha vuttānaṃ phassādidhammānaṃ khaṇasamavāyāhetusaṅkhātassa ca samayassa bhāvena tesāṃ bhāvo lakkhīyati, tasmā tadatthajotanatthaṃ tattha bhumma-vacanena niddeso kato.*<sup>17</sup>

In the *Abhidhamma* [the word “*samaya*”] occurs with the meaning of locus (*adhikaraṇattho*) and with the meaning of qualification of [one] action through [another] action (*bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇattho*). Because (*hi*) the locus (*adhikaraṇaṃ*) is

<sup>16</sup> For another part of the same section, cf. the analysis of the text on *adhikaraṇa* and *bhāvalakkhaṇa*, q.v. infra.

<sup>17</sup> The same text occurs with minor changes at Sv I 33,10–15; Ps I 9,14–19; Spk I 11,15–21; Mp I 13,7–13; cf. As 61,27–32 [one does not usually find statements with grammatical implications in As]: *adhikaraṇaṃ hi kālasaṅkhāto samūhasaṅkhāto samayo tattha vuttadhammānaṃ ti adhikaraṇavasen' etha bhummaṃ. khaṇasamavāyāhetusaṅkhātassa ca samayassa bhāvena tesāṃ bhāvo lakkhīyati ti bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇavasen' etha bhummaṃ.* The whole passage looks very much like a grammatical afterthought added as a note to the otherwise detailed exegesis of Dhs § 1, to which also Buddhaghosa's exegesis relates. The passage is perhaps a slightly edited quotation from Buddhaghosa.

the occasion in the sense of the time and collection of the dhammas as explained therein [i.e. in the *Abhidhamma*] like, e.g. touch (*phassādidhammānaṃ*), and because their action is qualified through the action of the occasion which is denoted moment, combination, and cause (*khaṇasamavāyāhetusaṅkhātassa ca samayassa bhāvena*),<sup>18</sup> (*tasmā*) the specification [of circumstances] is made therein [i.e. in the *Abhidhamma*] in the locative.<sup>19</sup>

In order to understand the scope of Buddhaghosa's rather complex exegesis, it is necessary to know the grammatical background of his argument. Buddhaghosa takes his point of departure in two well-known functions of the locative as defined by Pāṇini. The basic usage of the loc. is to denote any given locus (*adhikaraṇa*) of an action. Pāṇini defines this locus in Pāṇ I 4 45 in terms of being the support or substratum (*ādhāra*) of an action: *ādhāro 'dhikaraṇaṃ*.<sup>20</sup> Another syntactical function of the locative is the so-called absolute locative. Pāṇini describes this usage in Pāṇ II 3 [+36] 37: *yasya ca bhāvena bhāvalakṣaṇam*: moreover, the thing, due to whose action some other action is qualified, stands in [the seventh case, i.e. the locative]. Buddhaghosa's technical vocabulary, as it appears from his exegesis, is completely identical with Pāṇini's. He even seems to quote Pāṇ II 3 37 in a slightly edited Pāli version.<sup>21</sup>

The canonical *Abhidhamma* passage, which Buddhaghosa interprets in the light of Pāṇinian grammar, is Dhs § 1, defining the particular occasion (*samaya*) on which certain dhammas are to be considered good (*kusala*). I quote only the part that is necessary for understanding Buddhaghosa's interpretation:

<sup>18</sup> Cf. the verse — probably stemming from an unknown Pāli *kośa* — which Buddhaghosa quotes in Sp 107,1–2:

*samavāye khaṇe kāle samūhe hetuḍḍhisu  
paṭilābhe pahāne ca paṭivedhe ca dissati.*

<sup>19</sup> In his translation of the same passage, as quoted in Pj I, Bhikkhu Ñānamoli takes *bhāva* to mean substantive, and thus misinterprets the issue under discussion; cf. Pj I-trsl. (*Illustrator*) p. 114.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Dhammapāla's Ud-a 22,5–8 which quotes Buddhaghosa's explanation interspersed with glosses: *Abhidhamme ... ādhārabhāvasaṅkhāto* [so read; Ee *ādhārassa visayasāṅkhāto*] *adhikaraṇattho. kiriyāya kiriyantaralakkhaṇasāṅkhātena bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇattho ca sambhavati*; cf. also Dhammapāla's Sv-pt qu. n. 23 infra, which alludes to this Pāṇini sūtra.

<sup>21</sup> The *yasya ca* of II 3 37 only makes sense in connection with the preceding sūtra and was therefore omitted by Buddhaghosa.

*yasmim samaye kāmāvacaram kusalam cittam uppannam hoti ... tasmim samaye phasso hoti, vedanā hoti, saññā hoti, cetanā hoti ... : ime dhammā kusalā.*

On which occasion (*yasmim samaye*) a good thought that is active within the sphere of the sensuous universe, has originated ... on this occasion (*tasmim samaye*) there is contact, feeling, perception, volition ... : these dhammas are good.

According to Buddhaghosa there are two ideas underlying the usage of the locatives *yasmim samaye ... tasmim samaye*. One is that the word *samaya* denotes the locus (*adhikarāna*) of action, in terms of a particular time (*kālattha*) and a particular collection (*samūhattha*) being the basis of the action, of certain dhammas [= *phassa, vedanā, saññā, cetanā*, etc.]. The implied action is in this particular case expressed through the two verbs *uppannam (hoti)* and *hoti*. This is the strict locatival interpretation of *samaya*. It is understandable that time, as such, should be interpreted as the locus of an action. It is less obvious how a collection of certain dhammas [i.e. conditions] could be taken, in a strict locatival sense, as the locus of an action. It would seem more straightforward to interpret this usage of the loc. in the sense of the aggregate being the cause [= *nimittasaptamī*] of the existence of other dhammas. The strict locatival interpretation would thus seem to be somewhat forced. However, when Buddhaghosa takes *samaya* in the sense of time (*kāla*) and a collection (*samūha*) [of dhammas], he draws on a tradition which is reflected in the verse defining the various meanings of *samaya*, which he quotes whenever he deals with the word *samaya*.<sup>22</sup>

The other function which Buddhaghosa attributes to the locative is more difficult to understand, because it is far from obvious how one could possibly interpret the grammatical structure of *yasmim samaye ... uppannam hoti ... tasmim samaye ... hoti* according to the Pāṇinian definition of the locativus absolutus.

The phrase *samayassa bhāvena* [cf. Sp 108,4 qu. above], however, gives a clue to what Buddhaghosa had in mind. The underlying idea is — as Dhammapāla explains in a similar context in Sv-ṭṭ, illustrating the syntactical properties of the absolute locative with a citation, in Pāli transla-

<sup>22</sup> Cf. the verse quoted above and v. the detailed exegesis at As 61,27–32 which clarifies the intention underlying Buddhaghosa's concise explanation.

tion, from Candravṛtti [ad Candra II 1 90] or the Kāśikā [ad Pāṇ II 3 37]<sup>23</sup> — that one should complement the locative phrases *yasmim samaye ... tasmim samaye* with the appropriate form of the pr. part. *sat* so as to read *yasmim samaye sati ... tasmim samaye sati*. The reason is that the verb *hoti* in the phrase *uppannam hoti* [q.v. supra] necessitates the complementation of existence (*sattā*) to *samaya* (*hotipadatthassa sattāviraḥābhāvato*) so as to form a regular absolute locative. In other words, the action of the origination of the mind (*cittassa uppādakiriyā*) and the action of the coming into existence of contact, etc. (*phassādīnaṃ bhavanakiriyā*) are both qualified by the existence of the occasion (*samayassa sattākiriya ... lakkhiyati*). Dhammapāla's explanation thus gives a clear exposition of the idea underlying Buddhaghosa's application of the Pāṇinian definition of the locativus absolutus to the phrases *yasmim samaye ... tasmim samaye*. The three meanings of moment, combination, and cause (*khaṇa, samavāya, and hetu*) which he ascribes to *samaya* are, in this case as well, related to the verse mentioned above, in which the various meanings of the word *samaya* are defined.

### 1.5 *karāṇa* and *hetu*

[Sp 108,5–11 ad Vin III 1,6]

This text continues the exegesis of the phrase *tena samayena*, as it occurs in Vin III 1,6. Buddhaghosa writes:

<sup>23</sup> Cf. his elaborate commentary at Sv-ṭṭ I 58,30 foll.: *adhikarāṇattho = ādhārattho. bhāva nāmo kiriyā, kiriyāya kiriyantaralakkhaṇam = bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇam. yathā kālo sabhāvadhammaparichinno sayam paramatthato avijjamāno pi ādhārabhāvena paññāto taṅkhaṇappavattānaṃ tato pubbe parato ca abhāvato: pubbaṅhe jāto, sāyaṅhe gacchatī ti ca ādisu. samūho ca avayavavinimutto avijjamāno pi kappanāmatasiddho avayavānaṃ ādhārabhāvena paññāpiyati: rukkhe sākā, yavarāsiyaṃ sambhūto ti ādisu; evam idhāpi ti dassento āha "adhikarāṇam hi ... dhammānaṃ" ti. yasmim kāle dhammapuñje vā kāmāvacaram kusalam cittam uppannam hoti, tasmim yeva kāle dhammapuñje vā [so read; Ee va] phassādayo pi hontī ti ayaṃ hi tattha attho. yathā ca "gāvisu dūyhamānāsu gato, duddhāsu āgato" [= Candravṛtti ad Candra II 1 90 and Kās ad Pāṇ II 2 37] ti dohanakiriyāya gamanakiriyā lakkhiyati, evam idhāpi: yasmim samaye, tasmim samaye ti ca vutte satī ti ayaṃ attho viññāyamāno eva hotipadatthassa [so read; Ee hoti padatthassa] sattāviraḥābhāvato ti samayassa sattākiriya [so read; Ee sattā kiriyā] cittassa uppādakiriyā phassādīnaṃ bhavanakiriyā ca lakkhiyati. yasmim samaye ti yasmim navame khaṇe, yasmim yonisomanasikārādihetumhi paccayasamavāye vā sati kāmāvacaram kusalam cittam uppannam hoti, tasmim yeva khaṇe, hetumhi, paccayasamavāye ca phassādayo pi hontī ti ubhayattha samayasaddena [so read with v.l.; Ee -sadde] bhummaniddeso kato lakkhaṇabhūtabhāvayutto ti dassento āha: khaṇa- ... lakkhiyati ti.*

*idha pana hetuattho karaṇattho ca sambhavati. yo hi so sikkhāpadapaññattisamayo Sāriputtādīhi pi dubbhiññeyyo, tena samayena hetubhūtena karaṇabhūtena ca sikkhāpadāni paññāpayanto sikkhāpadapaññattihetuñ ca avekkhamāno bhagavā tattha tattha vihāsi, tasmā tadatthajotanattham idha karaṇavacanena niddeso kato ti veditabbo.*<sup>24</sup>

In this context [i.e., in the context of the Vinaya], however, [the word “*samaya*”] occurs with the meaning of cause and with the meaning of instrument. Because (*hi*) the occasion for [Bhagavan’s] discoursing on the precepts was difficult to understand even for Sāriputta, etc., [and because] Bhagavan, while setting forth, through that [specific] occasion as a cause and an instrument (*hetubhūtena karaṇabhūtena*), the precepts and paying attention to the cause for discoursing on the precepts, lived in this or that [place], (*tasmā*) one should know that the indication [of circumstances] in this context [i.e., in the context of the Vinaya] is made by [using] the instrumental case (*karaṇavacanena*).

There is no grammatical subtlety involved in this comment. Buddhaghosa’s terminology shows that he has in mind Pāṇini’s definitions of the usage of the instrument *kāraka*, in Pāṇ II 3 18: *karṭṭkaraṇayoḥ tṛtīyā*, and II 3 23: *hetau*. In these sūtras Pāṇini explains that the instrument *kāraka* is used in the sense of an instrument or a cause of something. The identification of the relevant Pāṇini sūtras is corroborated by Buddhaghosa’s usage of the terms *hetubhūta* and *karaṇabhūta*.

It is noteworthy that some of the examples which Sāriputta and Dhammapāla quote in their respective commentaries on Buddhaghosa’s text appear to be quoted from Candragomin’s commentary on his grammar. This commentary was evidently used by the authors of the Kāśikā, which in many cases is indistinguishable from Candravṛtti.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> An expanded version of the same text is found at Ud-a 23,3–11.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *annena vasati vijjāya vasati ti ādisu viya hetuattho. pharasunā chindati. kuddālena khaṇati ti ādisu viya karaṇattho ca sambhavati* [Sp-ṭ Be 1903 I p. 186,27–28] ≠ Dhammapāla Sv-ṭ I 559,23–24 [cf. Ud-a 22,32–23,3]. These examples are partly identical with Candravṛtti ad Candra II 1 68: *hetau: ... annena vasati. vidyayā yaśaḥ* [cf. Kāś ad Pāṇ II 3 23: *dhanena kulam. kanyayā śokaḥ. vidyayā yaśaḥ*; for Sv-ṭ *ajjhena vasati*, read *vijjāya vasati*] and 63: *karāṇe: ... dātrena lunāti, paraśunā chinatti* [= Kāś ad Pāṇ II 3 18]. Note that the examples

## 1.6 nimitta

[Sp 189,7–28 ad Vin III 8,30–33]

The Vinaya passage which Buddhaghosa attempts to interpret is syntactically ambiguous and difficult to construe. This fact leads him to suggest two alternative solutions to the problem, neither of which, however, is satisfactory. The passage reads:

*tatra sudam Sāriputta bhimsanakassa vanasaṇḍassa bhimsanakatasmim hoti yo koci avītarāgo tam vanasaṇḍam pavisati yebhuyyena lomāni haṃsanti.*

The syntax of this sentence raises several problems of interpretation. It is, in the first place, not clear how we are to construe *tatra*. Buddhaghosa suggests that it be taken as an anaphora, referring back to what has been said in the previous sentence (*tatrā ti purimavacanāpekkham*). He interprets *sudam* as an expletive particle (*sudan ti padapūraṇamatte nipāto*), and construes the sentence as follows (*ayam pan’ ettha athayojanā*):

*tatrā ti yaṃ vuttam aññatarasmim bhimsanake vanasaṇḍe ti. tatra yo so bhimsanako ti vanasaṇḍo vutto tassa bhimsanakassa vanasaṇḍassa bhimsanakatasmim hoti, bhimsanakiriyāya hoti ti attho. kim hoti? idaṃ hoti: yo koci ... lomāni haṃsanti ti.*

The expression “therein (*tatra*)” [refers back to the clause] “in a horrifying jungle-thicket [= Vin III 8,23].” In this case the jungle-thicket is explained (*vutto*) by the word “horrifying (*bhimsako*).” It happens (*hoti*), on account of this horrifying jungle-thicket’s creating horror (*bhimsanakassa vanasaṇḍassa bhimsanakatasmim*), that ... , i.e. (*iti attho*), it happens, because of its action of [creating] horror (*bhimsanakiriyāya*), that ... What happens? It happens that whoever enters this jungle-thicket without being devoid of passion, [his] hair as a rule stands on end (*haṃsanti*).

*pharasunā chindati* and *kuddālena khaṇati* have a parallel in Kacc-v ad Kacc 281: *yena vā kariyate tam karaṇaṃ: ... pharasunā rukkham chindati. kuddālena rukkham khaṇati.*

From this exegetical tour de force it becomes clear that Buddhaghosa interprets *bhimsanakatasmim* as a compound, which he apparently derives from *bhimsana* + *kata*. According to Sāriputta, *kata* (n.) is to be interpreted as an action noun (*bhāvasādhana*),<sup>26</sup> but apart from that he makes no suggestion for the derivation of *kata*, about which Buddhaghosa also leaves us in the dark. The gloss *bhimsanakiriyāya*, however, would seem to indicate that he took *kata* as a pp. [ $\sqrt{kr}$ ], and that he interpreted it as a neuter noun, equivalent to *kiriya* in the compound *bhimsanakiriyā*. As indicated by Buddhaghosa's gloss, he interpreted the locative in a causal sense (*nimitta* = *nimittasaptamī*).<sup>27</sup>

In the second alternative he returns more explicitly to this interpretation of the locative. First he suggests taking the locative *tatra* in the sense of the genitive (*tatrā ti sāmīatthe bhumman*). He interprets *sudam* as a sandhi form of the particle (*nipāta*) *su* and the pronoun *idam*, with elision of the *-i-* (*sandhivasena ikāralopo vedītabbo*), and he finally construes the sentence as follows (*ayaṃ paṇ' ettha atthayojanā*):

*tassa Sāriputta bhimsanakassa vanasaṇḍassa bhimsanakatasmim idam su hoti. bhimsanakatasmim ti bhimsanakabhāve ti attho. ekassa takārassa lopo datṭhabbo. bhimsanakakattasmim yeva vā pāṭho, bhimsanakatāya iti vā vattabbo, līṅgavipallāso kato. nimittatthe c' etaṃ bhumnavacanaṃ, tasmā evaṃ sambandho vedītabbo: bhimsanakabhāve idam su hoti; bhimsanakabhāvanimittam, bhimsanakabhāvahetu, bhimsanakabhāvapaccayā idam su hoti: yo koci ... lomāni haṃsantī ti.*

This, Sāriputta, surely happens on account of this horrifying jungle-thicket's causing horror. [The word] *bhimsanakatasmim* means "on account of being horrifying." One should observe that a *-t-* [in *bhimsanakatasmim*] has been elided [from *bhimsanakat(t)asmim*]. Either the [correct] reading is

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Sp-ṭ Be 1903 I 406,10–12: *katan ti bhāvasādhanavāci idam padan ti āha bhimsanakatasmim bhimsanakakiriyāya ti. bhimsanassa karaṇaṃ kriyā bhimsanakataṃ. tasmim bhimsanakatasmim*.

<sup>27</sup> The interpretation of the locative (*bhumman*) in a causal sense (*nimittatthe*) is rarely met with in the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās. Apart from this example, I can only refer to Pj II 321,9 and 433,23 for similar interpretations of the locative in Pāli.

*bhimsanakakattasmim*, or one should read [as if it were] *bhimsanakatāya*, a change of gender (*līṅgavipallāso*) being made [of the abs. suffix *-tā* (f.) to *-ta* (m. or n.)]. Also (*ca*) this locative is used in the sense of a cause (*nimittatthe*). Therefore one should know that the connection (*sambandho*) [between the terms in the sentence, i.e., the syntax] is as follows: on account of being terrifying this surely happens, i.e., because of being terrifying, due to being terrifying, by reason of being terrifying this happens viz. that whoever enters this jungle-thicket without being devoid of passion, [his] hair as a rule stands on end.

This interpretation would seem to create as many problems as it tries to solve. Buddhaghosa is no doubt correct in suggesting the emendation *bhimsanakattasmim*, which makes better sense than the unusual compound *bhimsana* + *kata*. His gloss *bhimsanakabhāve* shows that he interprets, as one would assume, the abstract suffix *-tta* (n.) [ $\sqrt{t}$  + *-va*] according to Pāṇ V 1 119: *tasya bhāvas tvatalau*.<sup>28</sup> There is no reason to believe, however, that he is right in claiming that the locative *tatra* = *tassa*. Nor is Buddhaghosa's derivation of the particle *sudam* from the particle *su* [ $\sqrt{sm}$ ] + *idam* correct. It is rather to be derived from *su* + *taṃ* > *sudam* [= Sanskrit *sma tad*].<sup>29</sup> The reason is no doubt that he felt the need for a pronoun in construction with the relative pronoun *ya*, introducing the subordinate clause. In the case of *sudam*, however, canonical usage shows that it is exclusively used adverbially, i.e. as a particle (*nipāta*), which Buddhaghosa correctly suggests in the first alternative. The phrase *tatra sudam* or *tatra pi sudam* is often found in canonical narrative prose.<sup>30</sup> In every single case *tatra* has a locative sense and *sudam* is merely used as an emphatic, often untranslatable, particle. It is clear that Buddhaghosa's interpretation is a result of a desperate attempt to construe an otherwise syntactically ambiguous sentence. First of all, he is forced to find a solution to the locative *bhimsanakatasmim*. Although he is probably correct in assuming that this form has to be

<sup>28</sup> There are many allusions to this Pāṇinian sūtra in the Aṭṭhakathās, e.g. Spk II 12,33 (ad S II 3,1): *cavanatā ti bhāvavacanena lakkhaṇanidassanaṃ* = Vibh-a 100,20; *māyāvino bhāvo māyāvītā*, Vibh-a 493,16.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. O. von Hinüber, *Überblick*, § 134.

<sup>30</sup> For *tatra sudam*, cf. D I 1,10; M I 473,19; M II 164,5; for *tatra pi sudam*, cf. D I 119,1; II 91,6; II 126,6.



amended to read *bhimsanakattasmim*, it is nonetheless questionable whether his interpretation of the locative in a causal sense is correct. It is understandable, however, that Buddhaghosa, whose knowledge of grammar was largely, or perhaps exclusively, dependent upon Pāṇinian grammar, would try to find a solution to the problem of the locative *bhimsanakatasmim* in Pāṇinian grammar. He probably found it in Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ II 3 36 [+vārttika 6 ad loc.].<sup>31</sup> Vajirabuddhiṭikā confirms this assumption by quoting a slightly edited Pāli version of a Sanskrit verse which Patañjali quotes ad loc. as an illustration of *nimittasaptamī*.<sup>32</sup>

It is not possible to find an absolutely satisfactory solution to the syntactical problem of the sentence causing Buddhaghosa to write such an elaborate grammatical analysis. The locative *tatra* is probably to be construed with the *yo* of the relative clause, and can, in fact, be interpreted in the sense of a *nimittasaptamī*. As for the locative *bhimsanakattasmim* (adopting Buddhaghosa's emendation), I would suggest interpreting it in a predicative sense<sup>33</sup> — for which there are a few interesting canonical examples [v. infra] — and translating the sentence in the following way:

This indeed, Sāriputta, is the reason why the horrifying jungle-thicket is called horrifying, namely, that whoever enters this jungle-thicket without being devoid of passion, [his] hair as a rule stands on end.<sup>34</sup>

The whole purpose of the sentence is obviously to give an "etymology" of the word *bhimsanaka*, which is here explained with reference

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Mahā-bh and vārt. 6 ad loc.: *nimittāt karmasamyoge* [= vārt 6]. *nimittāt karmasamyoge saptamī vaktavyā*.

*carmaṇi dvīpinam hanti dantayor hanti kuṅjaram  
keśesu camariṇ hanti sīmni puṣkalako hataḥ.*

<sup>32</sup> Cf.: *nimittatthe ti ettha*

*cammani dīpinam hanti, dantesu hanti kuṅjaram  
vālesu cāmarim hanti, siṅgesu saraso hatō.*

*ti adhikaraṇam* [Vjb Be 1960 57,26–27]; cf. Ja VI 61,3 foll. ≠ 78,17.

<sup>33</sup> This particular usage of the loc. in Pāli is normally found with verba sentiendi et dicendi [cf. O. von Hinüber, *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli*, § 294]. The present usage differs syntactically from the few examples quoted in op. cit. § 294, in that it is not constructed with a verbum sentiendi et dicendi.

<sup>34</sup> In I. B. Horner's translation the sentence reads: Moreover, Sāriputta, whoever not devoid of passion, is in a terror of the awe-inspiring jungle-thicket, and enters the jungle-thicket, as a rule his hair stands on end [*Book of the Discipline*, I, p. 16].

to the root  $\sqrt{ham}$ s [ $< * \sqrt{hrs}$ ] ≠ the stem  $\sqrt{bhims}$ - [ $< bhī$ ma deriv.  $< * \sqrt{bhī}$ ].<sup>35</sup> Fanciful etymologies of this type, being based upon a superficial phonetic similarity, are a well-known feature in Indian literature.<sup>36</sup> They are, for instance, to be found in great number in the Brāhmaṇa texts and the early Upaniṣads, not to mention Yāska's Nirukta. The way in which they are formulated, e.g. in the early Upaniṣads, would seem to lend support to Buddhaghosa's correction *bhimsanakatta*. In the majority of cases the reason for the nature or particular form of any given word *x* is explained there in terms of its *x*-ness.<sup>37</sup> This fits very well into the present context, where the word *bhimsanaka* is explained in terms of its *bhimsanaka*-ness, which is due to the fact that it makes people's hair stand on end (*hamsanti*).

The predicative usage of the loc. is rarely met with in the canon. As a matter of fact, I have only been able to identify two canonical examples, both from the Dighanikāya. One example is D I 63,22: *idam pi 'ssa hoti sīlasmim*: this is what he has as virtue. The other example is D II 221,7: *idam tesam hoti āsanasmim*: this is what they have as seat.<sup>38</sup> It is clear that Buddhaghosa was ignorant of this function of the loc. because in Sv 182,14–18 ad D I 63,22 he quotes the view of the Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā as an alternative to his own explanation according to which the loc. has a partitive sense [cf. Pāṇ II 3 41]. The Aṭṭhakathā, however, is correct in interpreting the loc. as equivalent to the nominative (= *pacattavacanatthe*) as shown by the quote *idam pi tassa samanassa sīlam*, which simply is one way of saying that the loc. has a predicative function.<sup>39</sup>

Buddhaghosa's alternative suggestions for interpreting the above Vinaya passage are ingenious, but certainly wrong. The main reason is that in general his grammatical analyses are dependent on whether he can find a paragraph in Pāṇinian grammar that is applicable to the problem in question. This obviously is not the case in this context, and his failure to interpret the

<sup>35</sup> The association of  $\sqrt{ham}$ s- and  $\sqrt{bhims}$ - is common in the canon. Cf., for example, the canonical juxtaposition of *lomahaṃsa* and *bhimsanaka* in D II 106,23.

<sup>36</sup> For examples from Pāli canonical lit., cf. Norman, "Four Etymologies from the Sabhiya-sutta", *Buddhist Studies in honour of Walpola Rahula*, London 1980, pp. 173–84.

<sup>37</sup> Cf., for example, Brhadāraṇyakōpaniṣad I 2.1: *so 'rcann acarat. tasyārcata āpo 'jāyanta. arcate vai me kam abhūd iti. tad evārkaśyārkatvam*; v. ibid. I 2.5.

<sup>38</sup> Buddhaghosa does not comment on this clause. Perhaps the reason is that he did not find any suggestions in the old Aṭṭhakathā as to its interpretation.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Sv loc. cit.: *Mahā-Aṭṭhakathāyam hi idam pi tassa samanassa sīlam ti ayam eva attho vutto*, which indicates that, in the commentarial tradition, there was a clear understanding of the predicative function of the locative.

sentence correctly can be ascribed to the fact that Pāṇinian grammar does not recognize a similar function of the locative.

### 1.6 *samīpa*

[Sp 108,21–22 ad Vin III 1,6]

As appears from his reference to the usage of the loc. in the sense of cause (*nimitta*), Buddhaghosa must have been conversant with the Pāṇinian tradition as a whole. This is also the case in the context where he claims that the loc. is used in the sense of being close to or nearby something (*samīpattha*), although in this particular case he may rely on grammatical sources that are no longer accessible. In Sp 108,21–22,<sup>40</sup> commenting upon the loc. *Verañjāyaṃ* in the clause *Verañjāyaṃ ... viharati*, he writes: *Verañjāyaṃ samīpatthe bhummavacanam*: “by *Verañjā*” is a locative in the sense of vicinity (*samīpa*). Buddhaghosa illustrates the meaning of this particular usage with the following example: *yathā Gaṅgayamunādīnaṃ samīpe goyūthāni carantāni Gaṅgāya caranti Yamunāya caranti ti vuccanti evam idhāpi* [= Sp 109,18–19]: just as the cowherds that graze in the vicinity of [the rivers] Ganges and Yamuna are said to graze by the Ganges and the Yamuna, so also in this context.

Although there is no mention of this usage of the loc. in Pāṇini, it can be traced to Mahā-bh II 218,14–19 where it is used in a context analogous to the one with which Buddhaghosa is dealing: *tatsamīpyāt: Gaṅgāyāṃ ghoṣaḥ* [= Mahā-bh loc. cit.]. Elsewhere Patañjali mentions three types of locatival *kāraka* relations: *adhikaraṇam nāma triprakāram vyāpakam aupasleṣikam vaiṣayikam iti* [= Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ VI 1 72]. To these the Pāli grammarians add *samīpika*.<sup>41</sup> Although there can be no doubt that the use of *samīpika* has its origin in Mahā-bh — Aggavaṃsa’s citation of Mahā-bh loc. cit. in connection with his discussion of *samīpika* proves this beyond doubt — it has not been possible to find a justification, in contemporary Sanskrit grammatical sources, for the inclusion of *samīpa* in the locatival *kāraka* relations; therefore its historical background remains unclear.<sup>42</sup> Buddhaghosa’s

<sup>40</sup> For other references to *samīpattha*, cf. Sv I 132,23; Spk I 12,31 = Mp I 15,1 = Pj I 111,5.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. the *kārikā* qu. in Rūp Ce 1897 113,29–30:

*vyāpiko : tilakhirādi; kaṭo : opasilesiko  
sāmīpiko : gaṅgādi; ākāso : visayo mato.*

<sup>42</sup> It is noteworthy that the examples of the usage of the locative that are quoted in Candravṛtti ad Candra II 1 88 (*kaṭe āste. ākāse kunayaḥ. tileṣu tailam. Gaṅgāyāṃ gāvah*) are used as illustrations of the various types of locative relations that are mentioned in the verse

example illustrating the *samīpattha* is analogous to the one used by Candragomin in Candravṛtti [ad II 1 88]: *gaṅgāyāṃ gāvah*, but Candragomin does not use the corresponding technical term for defining the nature of the locative. One cannot, of course, exclude the possibility that Buddhaghosa has taken his example from a common stock of examples illustrating *sāmīpya* and that he applied it ad hoc. For instance, one finds the following illustration of *sāmīpya* in Vātsyāyana’s Bhāṣya ad Nyāyasūtra II 2 62: *sāmīpyād — gaṅgāyāṃ gāvāś caranti*.

### [ B ]

#### Grammatical references in Paramatthajotikā I–II

Almost all the references to the views of the grammarians, or occasional allusions to Pāṇini, that are found in Pj I and II have already been identified by Helmer Smith in his careful editions of these important commentaries, but he never attempted a study of them. They are interesting and should be included in a study of the Pāli grammatical tradition as it is reflected in the Aṭṭhakathās. Since Pj II was written before Pj I, it is here treated before Pj I.

[Pj II 23,12–26 ad Sn 14]

In the first example the author deals with two problems. The first is an apparent morphological anomaly: the pp. *samūhatāse* [< \**samud* + √*han*] that occurs in the clause: *yassa ... mūlā akusalā samūhatāse* “who has destroyed all the evil roots.” On this form he writes:

*samūhatā icc’ eva attho, paccattabahuvacanassa hi (a)sakā-rāgamaṇ<sup>43</sup>* [so read ? Ee sa-; Be se-] *icchanti saddalakkhaṇa-kovidā. aṭṭhakathācariyā pana se ti nipāto ti vaṇṇayanti. yaṃ ruccati, taṃ gahetabbaṃ.*

quoted by Buddhapiya in Rūp Ce 1897 113,29–30 [q.v. supra]. Comparatively late Sanskrit grammatical sources mention *sāmīpyaka* (scil. *adhikaraṇa*) as a subset of the locative *kāraka*; v. Renou, *Terminologie*, s.v. *adhikaraṇa*.

<sup>43</sup> For this emendation, cf. the discussion infra.

The meaning is the same as (*eva*) [of the form] “*samūhatā*,” because (*hi*) the grammarians claim that the nominative plural (*paccatabhuvacanassa*) gets the augment *as*. The teachers of the Aṭṭhakathās, however, comment that *se* is a particle. One may adopt whichever [view] one prefers.

One finds here the same scholarly attitude towards grammatical problems as is normal practice in Buddhagosa [cf. Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I]: first the view of the grammarians is presented and then the view of the aṭṭhakathācariyas.

The reading *sakārāgama*, however, is problematic. One would expect the reading *sekāra-* in accordance with the canonical reading, but the manuscript tradition seems to consistently read *sa* for the expected *se*.<sup>44</sup> Assuming that the reading *sa* is not an old corruption and that the author is trying to explain the ending *-āse* with reference to the grammarians’ view, one might suggest reading *asakārāgama*, from which the *a* was probably elided in conjunction with the immediately preceding *hi*. If this assumption is correct, then the reference to grammarians (*saddalakkhanakovidā*) becomes understandable. As a rule such references are to Sanskrit grammarians. This implies that the author is referring to Sanskrit;<sup>45</sup> and in this particular case he is probably thinking of those Vedic plural forms ending in *-āsas*, which Pāṇini addresses in Pāṇ VII 1 [38+] 50: *ājjaser asuk*: after stems in *a* or *ā* [the nom. pl. augment *as*] gets [in the Veda the augment denoted] *asuk* [= *as*].<sup>46</sup> However, the author of Pj was probably not aware of the fact that Sanskrit *-āsas* > Pāli *-āse*.<sup>47</sup> His primary intention seems to have been to contrast Sanskrit nom. pl. forms in *-āsas* with analogous Pāli nom. pl. forms in *-āse*.<sup>48</sup> It is therefore surprising that an authority like Aggavaṃsa regards the *se* as not constituting a part of the pl. form itself (*apadāyava*), and that he thus

<sup>44</sup> The reading of Be is probably a modern attempt at being consistent.

<sup>45</sup> He refers explicitly to Vedic Sanskrit (*sakkata*) at Pj II 43,21, q.v. infra.

<sup>46</sup> One cannot, of course, exclude the possibility that the author refers to the normal Sanskrit plural ending *-ās*, and that the *sakārāgama* is to be interpreted with reference to the Pāli plural ending *-ā + s*, which represents the normal Sanskrit nom. pl. ending. If so, it leaves the *-e* in *-āse* unexplained.

<sup>47</sup> The ending *-āse* is probably a reflex of an eastern Prakrit; cf. O. von Hinüber, *Überblick*, § 312. Analogous nom. pl. forms that occur in Sn are passed over in silence in Pj II, but they are correctly identified as such; cf. Pj II 368,5: *upāsakāse ti upāsakā icc eva vuttam hoti* (ad Sn 376); II 553,28: *paṇḍitāse = paṇḍitā* (ad Sn 875).

<sup>48</sup> This appears clearly from the way in which he correctly contrasts the form *carāmase* in Sn 32 with Sanskrit *carāmasi* at Pj II 43,21–22; v. infra.

would seem to agree with the aṭṭhakathācariyās that *se* is a particle (*nipāta*).<sup>49</sup>

The next problem the author addresses is the present form *jahāti* occurring in the first line of the refrain of the Urugasutta: *so bhikkhu jahāti orapāram*: this monk abandons this shore and the far shore, on which he writes the following concise comment:

*n’ eva ādiyati na pajahati, pajahitvā ṭhito ti vutto. tathā pi vattamānasamīpe vattamānavacanalakkhaṇena* [≠ Pāṇ III 3 131] *jahāti orapāran ti vuccati*.

What is meant is that he neither appropriates nor abandons, being in a state where he already has abandoned (*pajahitvā ṭhito*). In the same way also [the present form *jahāti* in the clause] “he abandons (*jahāti*) this and the far shore” is used, according to the rule about the present [being used to express the past or the future time], when [the past or the future time is] contiguous to the present time (*vattamānasamīpe*).

This interpretation alludes to Pāṇ III 3 131, in which Pāṇini lays down the rule that affixes that are employed for denoting the present time may also be used to express the past or future time, provided that they express the immediate past or future: *vartamānasamīpye vartamānavad vā*: optionally, [the affixes that are used to express the present time] may in the same way as when the meaning is that of present time, be used [in the sense of past or future time] when [the past or the future time is] contiguous to the present.

The reason why Buddhagosa alludes to this sūtra is, of course, that the present form *jahāti* of the refrain follows immediately after the pp. *samūhatāse*. This would seem to create a logical problem, because having given up *mūlā akusalā* is, according to Buddhagosa, equivalent to having given up “this and the far shore.” He therefore solves the problem with reference to this particular Pāṇini sūtra. In the present context this means that the tense value of the pp. *samūhatāse* takes precedence over the tense value of *jahāti* which thus assumes a past tense value, referring to the

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Sadd 513,14–15: *apadāyavo pana ... “mūlā akusalā samūhatā se [= Sn 14].”*

immediate past. Thus, following Buddhaghosa's analysis, one might translate the refrain: he has given up this and the far shore.

In the following example Buddhaghosa addresses the problem of the form *carāmase* that occurs in the verse: *Gopī ca ahañ ca ... brahmacariyaṃ Sugate carāmase* [= Sn 31]. He writes:

*carāmase iti carāma yaṃ hi taṃ sakkatena carāmasī ti vuccati, taṃ idha carāmase iti. aṭṭhakathācariyā pana se iti nipāto ti bhananti, ten' eva c' ettha āyācanattham sandhāya carema [v.l. carā-] se iti pi pāṭham vikappenti. yaṃ ruccati, taṃ gahetabbaṃ.*

[The form] *carāmase* = *carāma*, because [the form] which in Sanskrit reads *carāmasī*, in this [verse reads] *carāmase*. The teachers of the Aṭṭhakathā, however, say that *se* is a particle (*nipāto*), and therefore they optionally propose (*vikappenti*) the reading *carema se*, with regard to the meaning of the vow [expressed] therein [i.e. in the verb *carāma se (ettha āyācanattham sandhāya)*]. One may adopt which [view] one prefers.

It appears from Buddhaghosa's commentary that he interprets *carāmase* = *carāmasī* [Vedic ind. pr. 1 pl.]. We may therefore deduce that he also knew Sanskrit (*sakkata*) in its Vedic form, at least to the extent that it is covered by Pāṇini's rules for *chandās*. This fact also lends support to the suggestion [v. supra] that he contrasted Pāli nom. pl. *-āse* with Vedic nom. pl. *-āsas*, and that the proposed emendation therefore may be correct.

It is, of course, another question whether Buddhaghosa is correct in suggesting that *carāmase* = *carāmasī* = *carāma*. The form *carāmase* itself is ambiguous and admits of two interpretations: it may either be interpreted as indicative mid. 1 pl. [cf. Geiger § 122, which cites analogous forms that cannot be interpreted as subjunctive forms], the ending *-mase* being the middle counterpart of Vedic *-masi*, or as subjunctive mid. 1 pl. [cf. Geiger § 126 according to which *carāmase* belongs to this category].<sup>50</sup> In this case there is no reason to doubt that it is a subj. mid. form, and we may therefore translate Sn 31: Gopī and I ... shall practice *brahmacariya* for the sake of

<sup>50</sup> Cf. also Norman, *Elders' Verses* II, n. ad Th 370–71; O. von Hinüber, *Überblick*, § 433.

Sugata (*sugate* = *nimittasaptamī*). The *aṭṭhakathācariyas* apparently had preserved the tradition that it was a subjunctive<sup>51</sup> [cf. the phrase *āyācanattham sandhāya*], but they clearly were unable to analyse correctly the form itself, which is a Middle Indian innovation. Since Buddhaghosa had no other possibility of identifying the form than to try to find as close a parallel in Sanskrit as possible, he could only suggest that *carāmase* = *carāmasī*.<sup>52</sup> In those cases where analogous forms occur, he might have been correct [for the present ind. forms, cf. the forms listed in Geiger § 122], but in this context it would seem necessary to interpret *carāmase* as a subjunctive.<sup>53</sup>

In this example the presence of the ind. mid. 3 sg. *kurute*, in the verse *sante na kurute piyaṃ*:<sup>54</sup> he does not make good men his friends, gives Buddhaghosa another opportunity to display his knowledge of Pāṇinian grammar. He offers two alternative explanations of this clause, only the first of which can be considered correct: *sante na kurute piyaṃ, attano piye iṭṭhe kante manāpe na kurute iti attho* [= Pj II 169,11–13]. From this paraphrase it appears that he correctly interprets *piyaṃ* [= eastern acc. pl. *piye*], in apposition to *sante* [eastern acc. pl.].<sup>55</sup> This interpretation probably represents the view of the *aṭṭhakathācariyas*. In the second alternative, however, he suggests interpreting *kurute* according to Pāṇ I 3 32, which lays down the rule that when the verb  $\sqrt{kr}$  inter alia means “to revile” or “to serve,” the middle (*ātmanepada*) is used, even though the fruit of the action does not fall to the agent (*gandhanāvākṣepanasevanasāhasikyapratīyatna-prakathanōpayogeṣu kṛṇāḥ*). He therefore suggests the following paraphrase: *sante na sevati ti attho yathā rājānaṃ sevati*: they do not serve the good men, on the grounds that the grammarians take, e.g. the expression “*rājānaṃ pakurute*” in the same meaning (*etasmim atthe “rājānaṃ pakurute” ti saddavidū mantenti*).<sup>56</sup> The suggestion is ingenious, and it is therefore

<sup>51</sup> This speaks for the historical validity of the Aṭṭhakathā tradition, which in many cases has preserved the correct interpretation; cf. n. 39 supra.

<sup>52</sup> He evidently took *carāmase* = *carāmasī* = *carāma*, because he quotes Ja IV 53,20: *brahmacariyaṃ carāma* as a parallel.

<sup>53</sup> This applies mutatis mutandis to the interpretation of *bhavāmase* in the following line of Sn 31; cf. Pj II 44,2–4.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Dh 217: *taṃ jano kurute piyaṃ*: such a man the world makes its friend.

<sup>55</sup> For *piyaṃ* = eastern acc. pl., v. Lüders, *Beobachtungen*, § 205.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Fausbøll's translation which tries to do justice to the “Pāṇinian” interpretation: he does not do anything that is dear to the good, which Lüders [op. cit., § 205] incorrectly claims does not do justice to the medium.

surprising that Buddhaghosa did not simply take *piyaṃ* as acc. pl. in apposition to *sante*, but proposed to interpret *piyaṃ* as a part.<sup>57</sup> Indeed, it cannot be entirely excluded that we have to translate: the good men he does not treat as his friends. Nor is it impossible that the parallel in Dhṛ 217: *taṃ jano kurute piyaṃ*, is to be translated as: such a man the world treats as a friend.

[Pj II 321,10–12 ad Sn 302]

Commenting on the phrase “*pahūtadhanadhañño ’si*, *yajassu*, *bahu te vittam*, *yajassu*, *bahu te dhanam*,” Buddhaghosa writes:

*pahūtadhanadhañño ’sī ti*, *pahūtadhanadhañño bhavissasi abhisamparāyan ti adhippāyo*, *āsaṃsāyaṃ hi anāgate pi vat-tamānavacanaṃ icchanti saddakovidā*.

The intention (*adhippāyo*) of [the clause] “you become<sup>58</sup> abundantly rich” is “you shall become abundantly rich in the future,” because (*hi*) those who are well versed in grammar (*saddakovidā*) claim that, in the case of a wish (*āsaṃsā*), the present is also used in the sense of the future.

The grammarians to whom the author refers here are, as one would expect, Pāṇinians. In this case the Pāṇinian rule that justifies his exegesis is found in Pāṇ III 3 [131+] 132: *āsaṃsāyāṃ bhūtavac ca*: in the case of a wish [the affixes that are used to express the present time or the past time] may [optionally, i.e., instead of the affixes expressing the future time] be used in the same way as when [the meanings are that of present time] and that of past time.

The intention of the reference to the grammarians becomes clear when one takes a look at Buddhaghosa’s paraphrase: *mahārāja*, *bahu te vittam dhanam ca*, *yajassu*, *āyatim pi pahūtadhanadhañño bhavissasi ti*. He simply wants to show that the Sn clause has the following underlying structure: May you offer [= if you offer] ... then you shall become abundantly rich. It is therefore clear that he is forced to give a reason for why the present form *asi*, which he tacitly interprets as equivalent to *bhavati*, is used instead of the expected future. He consequently turned to the relevant Pāṇini sūtra which would seem to justify his exegesis. However, there is

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Pj II 169,16–17: *piyan ti piyamāno tussamāno modamāno ti attho*.

<sup>58</sup> I translate *asi* = *bhavati* in accordance with Buddhaghosa’s intention; v. infra.

nothing in the verse that would support this learned display of Sanskrit grammar. The clause *pahūtadhanadhañño ’si* is clearly syntactically co-ordinated with the clauses *bahu te vittam* and *bahu te dhanam*, and thus one cannot, without distorting the syntax of the verse, attribute the value of *āsaṃsā* to the usage of *asi*.

[Pj I 17,28–19,22 on “*buddham saraṇam gacchāmi*”]

Nearly all the exegeses of grammatical interest that occur in Paramatthajotikā I are found in identical or slightly edited forms in other commentaries ascribed to Buddhaghosa. However, in one case where he deals with the controversy over the correct interpretation of the canonical stereotype *buddham saraṇam gacchāmi*, the scope of the discussion goes far beyond the corresponding treatment of the same sentence in his other commentaries.<sup>59</sup> Buddhaghosa deals briefly with the analogous phrase, *Bhagavantam saraṇam gacchāmi*, in Sv 229,18–23,<sup>60</sup> but without even touching upon the grammatical question of co-referentiality [= apposition (*samānādhikaraṇatta*)], which is the focal topic of the controversy recorded in Pj I. The following section is the most interesting part of it from a grammatical point of view:<sup>61</sup>

*codako āha: buddham saraṇam gacchāmi ti ettha, yo buddham saraṇam gacchati, esa buddham vā gaccheyya saraṇam vā. ubhayathā pi ca ekassa vacanaṃ niratthakam. kasmā ? gamanakiriyāya kammadvayābhāvato, na h’ ettha “ajam gāmaṃ neti” ti ādisu viya dikammakattaṃ akkharacintakā icchanti, — “gacchat’ eva pubbaṃ disaṃ gacchati pacchimaṃ disaṃ” [= S I 122,2] ti ādisu sātthakam evā ti ce, — na: buddhasaraṇānaṃ samānādhikaraṇabhāvassānādhipeṭato, etesaṃ hi samānādhikaraṇabhāve adhippete paṭihatacitto pi buddham upasaṃkamanto buddham saraṇam gato siyā, yaṃ*

<sup>59</sup> This is one of several indications that Pj I may not be by Buddhaghosa.

<sup>60</sup> Cf.: *bhagavā me saraṇam parāyanaṃ, aghassa tātā hitassa ca vidhātā ti iminā adhippāyena etaṃ gacchāmi bhajāmi sevāmi payirupāsāmi ti evaṃ vā jānāmi, bujjhāmi ti, yesaṃ hi dhātūnaṃ gati attho, buddhi pi tesam attho*, Sv 229,20–22 ≠ Pj I 19,1–3.

<sup>61</sup> Unfortunately the purport of the entire passage was misunderstood by Ñānamoli who translated *samānādhikaraṇabhāva* as “identical causativity” [v. *Illustrator*, p. 10 foll.].

*hi taṃ* “*buddho*” *ti visesitaṃ saraṇaṃ, taṃ ev’ esa gato ti* [= Pj I 17,29–18,6].

The objector (*codako*) says: In the [proposition] “I go to the Buddha, [to] protection,” the one who goes to Buddha, [to] protection, may either go to the Buddha or to the protection. In either case (*ubhayathā pi*), however, the word [that denotes] one [of them, i.e. *Buddhaṃ* or *saraṇaṃ*] is meaningless. — How can that be? — Because the verbal action of going does not take two object [*kāraṅga* (*kammadvaya*)]; for in this case the grammarians do not claim that there are two object [*kāraṅga*], in the same way as in [the proposition] “he takes the goat to the village.” Suppose you object that [the word that denotes one of them] is meaningful, in the same way as, for instance, [the word *pubbaṃ* or *disaṃ* in the phrase from S I 122,2]: “he goes to the eastern region, he goes to the western region.” This [assumption] is wrong (*na*), because it is not intended that [the word] Buddha and [the word] protection be co-referential [i.e., in apposition (*buddhasaraṇānaṃ samānādhikaraṇabhāvassānāhipetato*)]; for (*hi*) if it were intended that they be co-referential, even a depraved person who approached the Buddha would come to the Buddha as protection, because he has come to precisely that protection which is qualified as “Buddha” (*buddho ti visesitaṃ*).

The first objection is based upon the grammarians’ assumption that  $\sqrt{gam}$  cannot be constructed with two accusatives — except in its causative form — in the same way as  $\sqrt{ni}$ .<sup>62</sup> The example used for illustrating the opposition between  $\sqrt{ni}$  and  $\sqrt{gam}$ : *ajam gāmaṃ neti*, is quoted from a related discussion in Mahā-bh [= *ajam nayati grāmam*, Mahā-bh I 335,13 ad Pāṇ I 4 51].

The next objection starts from the assumption that *Buddhaṃ* and *saraṇaṃ* are in apposition (*samānādhikaraṇabhāva*). The idea is that *saraṇaṃ* qualifies *Buddhaṃ* in the same way as the two adjectives *pubbaṃ* or *pacchimaṃ* qualify *disaṃ*. In his *ṭīkā* [ad Sv 229,18–23] Dhammapāla claims

<sup>62</sup> Cf. the corresponding discussion at Sv-pt I 357,19–20 [ad Sv 229,18–23]: *ettha ca nāyaṃ gamusaddo nisaddādayo viya dvikammako*.

that it is necessary to complement the sentence according to its underlying syntax. In his view an *iti*, showing the apposition, has been elided after *saraṇaṃ*. The correct reading, according to Dhammapāla, should therefore be: *bhagavantaṃ saraṇaṃ iti gacchāmi*.<sup>63</sup> The author of Pj I objects to a similar view by pointing to the fact that, for instance, at S III 57,7: *aniccaṃ rūpaṃ aniccaṃ rūpaṃ ti yathābhūtaṃ pajānāti*, there is no *iti* found after *aniccaṃ*, as one would expect.<sup>64</sup> Consequently there is no need for complementing the sentence, which simply has to be interpreted as if an *iti* had been applied (*payutto viya*).<sup>65</sup> The claim that *saraṇaṃ* stands in apposition to *Buddhaṃ* or *Bhagavantaṃ* would seem to be grammatically sound. Accordingly we should translate the canonical stereotype: I go to the Buddha as [my] protection.

[ B ]

1 [Paṭi-a 538,6–8 ad Paṭi II 4,4–6]

In this grammatical note Mahānāma deals with the semantical and syntactical conditions under which the past participle in *-ta* is constructed with the genitive. The passage commented upon reads:

*na m’ ete bhikkhave samaṇā vā brāhmaṇā vā samaṇesu c’ eva samaṇasammatā brāhmaṇesu ca brāhmaṇasammatā.*

I do not, monks, consider these recluses or brāhmaṇas to be recluses among recluses and brāhmaṇas among brāhmaṇas.

In this clause *samaṇasammatā* is to be construed with *me*, and Mahānāma therefore comments:

*samaṇasammatā ti na mayā samaṇā ti sammatā. sammatā ti vattamānakālavasena vuccamāne saddalakkhaṇavasena me ti ettha sāmivacanam eva hoti.*

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Sv-pt I 357,21–23: *bhagavantaṃ saraṇaṃ gacchāmi ti vattuṃ na sakkā; saraṇaṃ ti gacchāmi ti pa vattaṃ. itisaddo c’ ettha luttaniddiṭṭho*.

<sup>64</sup> The author evidently interprets the syntactical function of *niccaṃ* as equivalent with, e.g., the predicative usage of ablatives in *-to* [*< \*-tas*] used at S III 57,5 (*attato*).

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Pj I 19,4 foll.

*samaṇasammata*, i.e. I do not consider them as recluses. When [the past participle] *sammata* is used in terms of the present tense, then (*ettha*) according to the grammatical rule, [the personal pronoun] *me* stands exclusively (*eva*) in the genitive.

Although Mahānāma refers to a specific Pāṇinian rule codified in Pāṇ II 3 67, his explanation also presupposes Pāṇ III 2 188. In this sūtra Pāṇini defines the semantical conditions under which the past participle in *-ta* is present in meaning: *matibuddhipūjārthebhyas ca*: And after [the roots] that denote thought, understanding or respect [the past participle affix denoted *ka* is used in the sense of the present tense].<sup>66</sup> This rule applies to the past participle *sammata* [*< sam + √man*] which is subsumed under the Pāṇinian *mati* [*< √man*].

The rule that applies to the construction with *me* is found in Pāṇ II 3 67 where Pāṇini lays out the conditions under which a past participle in *-ta* is constructed with the genitive: *ktasya ca vartamāne*: And [the past participle affix denoted] *ka* (= *-ta*), when it is used in the sense of the present tense, takes [the genitive of the agent in construction].<sup>67</sup> Since the enclitic form *me*, from a purely morphological point of view, is equivalent to the three case forms *mayā* [= instr.], *mayhaṃ* [= dat.], and *mama* [= gen.], Mahānāma uses the delimitative particle *eva* in order to emphasise that in this particular syntactical construction it is only possible to interpret *me* as genitive.<sup>68</sup>

## 2 [Paṭis-a 481,26–32 ad Paṭis I 172,34]

This reference takes its point of departure in a pun based upon the phonological affinity of *√ci* with *√ji*. Commenting upon the word *paricitā* at Paṭis I 172,5: *ānāpānasati yassa ... anupubbaṃ paricitā yathā Buddhena desitā*, Paṭis explains that *sati* is called *paricitā* [*< √ci*] because it conquers [*jināti < √ji*] bad and evil dhammas (*satiyā pariggaṇhanto jināti pāpake akusale dhamme, tena vuccati paricitā*). On this text Mahānāma writes inter alia the following commentary:

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Kās ad loc.: *etadarthebhyas ca dhātubhyo vartamānārthe ktapratyayo bhavati: rājñām matah, rājñām iṣṭah, rājñām buddhah, rājñām jñātaḥ, rājñām pūjitaḥ, rājñām arcitaḥ.*

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Kās ad loc.: *ktasya vartamānakālavhitasya prayoge ṣaṣṭhi vibhaktir bhavati: rājñām matah, rājñām buddhah.*

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Buddhaghosa's grammatical observations in Sv 28,8 foll. about the three meanings of *me*.

*te ca dhammā satim avihāya attano pavattikkhane jinitum āradadhā 'jitā' ti vuccanti, yathā bhuñjitum āraddho 'bhutto' ti vuccati. lakkhaṇam pan' ettha saddasatthato veditabbaṃ. evaṃ sante 'pi parijitā ti vattabbe ja-kārassa ca-kāraṃ katvā paricitā ti vuttaṃ ... imasmim athavikappe paricitā ti padaṃ kattusādhanam.*

And these [evil] dhammas that have started being conquered (*jinitum āradadhā*) at the moment, when he, without forsaking being mindful, applies himself [to the destruction of them], are said to have been conquered, in the same way as [someone who] has started eating (*bhuñjitum āraddho*) is said to have eaten. The rule, moreover, [that applies] in this case (*ettha*) should be known according to grammar (*saddasatthato*). Even though [the word *paricitā*] in those circumstances ought to read *parijitā*, [the reading] *paricitā* is used by substituting the letter *c* for the letter *j* ... In this alternative meaning the word *paricitā* [in its identity with *parijitā*] is active (*kattusādhanam*).<sup>69</sup>

There is no need to go into all the details of this exegetical tour de force: the basic intention is to show that *paricitā = parijitā* as a qualifier of *sati* [mindfulness] points to the fact that *sati* when practised properly (= *paricita*) annihilates the evil dhammas. The reading *paricitā* is well attested in canonical Pāli where it occurs in similar contexts.<sup>70</sup> Mahānāma obviously took the pun of Paṭis as an occasion for displaying his knowledge of grammar.

The reference itself is rather obscure, but from the context it seems clear that he must have thought of those cases — as shown by his remark that the word *paricitā* is active (*kattusādhanam*) — where a *-ta* participle [= *ka*] is used in an active sense, while at the same time having an inchoative sense, as indicated by the paraphrase *jinitum āradadhā* or *bhuñjitum āraddho*. A past participle in *-ta* is normally not used in the sense of the agent *kāraka*, i.e. in an active sense. In Pāṇ III 4 71, however, Pāṇini defines the semantical and syntactical conditions under which this is possible: *ādikarmani ktaḥ*

<sup>69</sup> Cf. the corresponding technical term of Sanskrit grammar *kartṛsādhanam*, on which see Renou, *Vocabulaire*, s.v.

<sup>70</sup> Cf., for example, S I 116,30; II 264,15.

*kartari ca*: the suffix “*ka*” is also used in the sense of the agent [*kāra*ka], in the case of an inchoative action (*ādikarmaṇi*). The Kāśikā [q.v. ad loc.] illustrates this rule by the following examples: *prakṛtaḥ kaṭaṃ devadattaḥ*: D. has started making a mat, and *prabhukta odanaṃ devadattaḥ*: D. has started eating. In this example the word *prakṛtaḥ* or *prabhuktaḥ* is in agreement with the agent [*kāra*ka] Devadatta, and it is therefore, according to Pāṇinian syntactical theory, used in the sense of the agent [*kāra*ka]. As shown by the example, the *ka* participle is constructed with the object *kāra*ka [= *kaṭaṃ* or *odanaṃ*].

Although one would have expected Mahānāma to illustrate his analysis with a more appropriate example (the context requires *pabhutto*, with the preposition *pa* [*< \*pra*] indicating the inchoative aspect of the action,<sup>71</sup> instead of *bhutto*), there is no reason to doubt that he refers to a grammatical rule similar to Pāṇ III 4 71. It is therefore surprising that his grammatical analysis does not reflect the Pāṇinian technical vocabulary. For instance, he uses *ārambh-* for the Pāṇinian *ādi*. This would indicate that he may well be referring to Candravyākaraṇa which substitutes *kriyārambha* [cf. Candra I 3 28]<sup>72</sup> for the Pāṇinian *ādikarma(n)*, because the strict Pāṇinian tradition, from the Kāśikā and onwards, does not use a similar technical term.

Although Candragomin’s grammar is written in the Pāṇinian tradition and does not deviate substantially from Pāṇini, it exhibits nonetheless noticeable innovations in its technical vocabulary. It is difficult to explain Mahānāma’s usage of *ārambh-* in this particular context unless we assume that he is dependent on a Sanskrit model, which in the present case is probably identical with Candravyākaraṇa: it would only be natural for a Buddhist scholar to avail himself of the grammar of a fellow Buddhist scholar.

### 3 [Paṭis-a 567,12–16 ad Paṭis II 63,34–35]

This discussion shows that Mahānāma knew of the controversy over the semantical properties of the absolutive suffix. I have dealt with Buddhaghosa’s treatment of this question in Studies in the Pāli Grammarians

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Jinendrabuddhi’s Nyāsa ad Kāśikā ad Pāṇ III 4 71: *sarvatra praśabda ādikarma dyotayati*.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Mogg-v ad V 58: *kattari cārambhe. kriyārambhe kattari kto hoti ... pakato bhavaṃ kaṭaṃ*. Moggalāna, as is well-known, has to a large extent based his grammar upon Candravyākaraṇa.

I, and I therefore refer the reader to the previous article in this series.<sup>73</sup> I should add, however, that Buddhaghosa actually does seem to be aware of the problems involved in putting a strict Pāṇinian interpretation on certain constructions with the absolutive, although it is difficult to decide from what he says whether or not he draws upon the grammarians’ discussion of the problem.

The text in question occurs in Vism 653,21–28 where Buddhaghosa comments upon the same Paṭis passage as Mahānāma. Mahānāma copied verbatim most of Buddhaghosa’s commentary. He deleted the introductory clause and inserted a reference to the grammarians’ view before the concluding passage, where Buddhaghosa explains that the origination process of knowledge has to be taken as a unity. Mahānāma’s intention was probably to complement Buddhaghosa’s explanation by showing that it was also supported by the authority of the grammarians.

“*nimittaṃ paṭisaṅkhā ñānaṃ uppajjati* [= Paṭis loc. cit.]”<sup>74</sup> *kāmaṃ ca na paṭhamam jānitvā pacchā ñānaṃ uppajjati. vohārasena pana “maṇaṃ [Ee w.r. mā-] ca paṭicca dhamme ca uppajjati manoviññānaṃ [= S IV 33,32]” ti ādīni viya evaṃ vuccati* [= Vism loc. cit.]<sup>75</sup> *Saddasatthavidū ’pi ca “ādiccaṃ pāpūnitvā tamo vigacchati” ti ādisu viya samānakāle ’pi imaṃ padaṃ icchanti. ekattanayena vā purimaṃ ca pacchimaṃ ca ekaṃ katvā evaṃ vuttan ti vedittabbaṃ* [= Vism loc. cit.]

“Knowledge arises by reflecting (*paṭisaṅkhā*) upon the object (*nimittaṃ*).” And it is by no means the case (*kāmaṃ ca na*) that, after having previously become known, knowledge subsequently arises. The [above passage] is propounded in accordance with common usage (*vohārasena*), in the same way as the [canonical proposition] “In dependence on the mind and the mental objects (dhamme) mental cognition arises,” and the like. The grammarians, moreover, acknowledge (*icchanti*)

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I, p. 51 foll.

<sup>74</sup> Mahānāma has deleted the following passage from Vism 653,21: *saṅkhāranimittaṃ adhuvaṃ tāvakālikan ti aniccalakkhaṇavasena jānitvā*.

<sup>75</sup> Here ends the first part of the quotation from Vism. The second part begins with the concluding clause *ekattanayena ... vedittabbaṃ*.



this [type of] inflected word (*padam*)<sup>76</sup> [= *paṭisaṅkhā*] even when [the absolutive affix attached to the verb *paṭisaṅkhāti* expressing one action] is used in the sense of being simultaneous in time (*samānakāle 'pi*) [with the other action expressed by the verb *uppajjati*] as, for instance, in the [proposition] “Darkness disappears in contact with the sun.”<sup>77</sup> Optionally (*vā*), one should know, according to the unity method (*ekattanayena*),<sup>78</sup> that it is expressed in this way by taking the preceding [action] and the subsequent [action] as one (*ekaṃ katvā*).

There is no way of explaining why Buddhaghosa, who obviously knew that the absolutive in certain cases admits of being interpreted in the sense of *samānakāla*, did not refer to the grammarians in this case. The definition laid out in Pāṇ III 4 21: *samānakarṭṛkayoḥ pūrvakāle*, clearly does not apply, and one would have expected him to point that out. Mahānāma, however, interprets Buddhaghosa’s explanation in the light of Kātyāyana’s supplement to Pāṇ III 4 21.<sup>79</sup>

Although the discussion of the semantics of the absolutive suffix can be traced back to Kātyāyana and Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ III 4 21, Kacc<sup>80</sup> and its main source, the Kātantra, take no notice of it. Nor do Vajirabuddhi [in Mmd ad Kacc 566] or Buddhapiya [ad Rūp 624 = Kacc 566], who copied almost verbatim the relevant passage from Mmd, go into a discussion of the problem. The same is the case with Moggallāna ad Mogg V 64. Aggavaṃsa, however, deals with it, and he may well be one of the first Pāli grammarians to have done so.<sup>81</sup>

## II

### 1 [Bv-a 25,26–30 ad Bv I 4b]

In this example, the most discursive of his grammatical analyses, Buddhadatta exhibits three ways of analysing the word “*buddha*” [formally a

<sup>76</sup> Cf. the Pāṇinian definition of *pada* (n.) in Pāṇ. I 4 14: *suptinantaṃ padam*.

<sup>77</sup> For analogous examples, cf. AkBhāṣ 455,7-8: *sahabhāve 'pi ca kvāsti dīpaṃ prāpya tamo gatam*; Vism-sn p. 1254,12: *dīpaṃ prāpya tamo vigacchati*.

<sup>78</sup> For this term, cf. CPD s.v. *ekattanaya*.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. vārttika 5 and Mahā-bh ad loc.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Kacc 566: *pubbakālekakattukānaṃ tun-tvāna-tvā vā*.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. the discussion at Sadd 312,22–313,30.

past participle in *-ta*], as it occurs in Bv I 4b (*buddho ayam idisako naruttamo*):

*Buddho ti catusaccadhamme buddho anubuddho ti buddho, yathāha:*

*abhiññeyyaṃ abhiññātaṃ*

*bhāvetabbaṃ ca bhāvitaṃ*

*pahātabbaṃ pahānaṃ me*

*tasmā buddho 'smi brāhmaṇa* [= Sn 558]

*Idha pana kattukārake buddhasaddasiddhi dattḥabbā. (so punctuate) adhigatavisesehi devamanussehi sammāsam-buddho vata so bhagavā ti evaṃ buddhattā ñātattā buddho. idha kammakārake buddhasaddasiddhi dattḥabbā. buddham assa atthi ti vā buddho buddhavanto ti attho. taṃ sabbaṃ saddasatthānusāreṇa veditaṃ.*

Buddha means [one who has] undertaken to know, [one who has] undertaken to recollect,<sup>82</sup> the norms of the four truths. As he says [in Sn 558]:

I have obtained insight into that into which one should obtain insight, and realised what has to be realised, and rejected what has to be rejected, therefore, brāhmaṇa, I am a Buddha.

In this [verse] the formation (*siddhi*) of the word “*buddha*” should be taken in the sense of the agent *kāraka* (*kattukāraka*), [i.e. in a transitive/active sense]. [Or, alternatively,] he is [called] Buddha because he is recognised and acknowledged by gods and men who have obtained eminence, in the following words: “the Bhagavan, indeed, is fully awakened.” In this case the formation of the word “*buddha*” should be taken in the sense of the object *kāraka*. Or (*vā*), he is Buddha because (*iti*) he has (*assa atthi*) awakening (*buddha* [n.]),<sup>83</sup> that is, he is “one who possesses awakening

<sup>82</sup> The reason for this translation will appear from the analysis below.

<sup>83</sup> Formally *buddha* (n.) is a neuter pp. used as a noun by analogy with neuter pp. forms in Sanskrit. Cf. Nidd 458,7 and 459,7 [ad Sn 957] and Pj I 16,2: *buddhi, buddham, bodho ti pariṇāyavacanāṃ*.

(*buddhavanta*).<sup>84</sup> All this should be known according to grammar.

Each of the three explanations which Buddhadatta suggests here would seem to depend on Pāṇinian grammar, although it is obvious that he has to some extent reinterpreted the scope of the relevant Pāṇinian rules so as to justify his grammatical analysis.

[ i ]

In the first alternative Buddhadatta ascribes a transitive value to *buddha*. It is clear, that this explanation — illustrated with the quotation of Sn 558 — has canonical support, because the Niddesa, in its comment upon the meaning of the word *buddha* in Sn 957, uses two nominal derivatives from  $\sqrt{budh}$ , with a transitive [+ causative] value, to explain its meaning:

*buddho ti ken' atthena buddho ? bujjhitā saccāni ti buddho, bodhetā pajāyā ti buddho.*<sup>85</sup>

In what sense is he a Buddha ? He is a Buddha because (*iti*) he [himself] knows the [four] truths, and he is a Buddha because he makes [them] known to mankind.<sup>86</sup>

In this gloss *bujjhitā* is a derivative in *-tr* from  $\sqrt{bujjh}$  [< passive stem \* $\sqrt{budhya}$ -] to be construed with *saccāni* [= acc.], whereas *bodhetā* is an analogous causative derivative [< causative stem  $\sqrt{bodhe}$ -] in *-tr*, to be construed with *saccāni* [= acc.] and *pajāyā* [= dat./gen.].<sup>87</sup>

<sup>84</sup> I.B. Homer's translation is based upon a wrong punctuation of the text and thus confuses the point at issue.

<sup>85</sup> Qu. Paṭi I 174,7; Vism 209,21; Sadd 481,28; cf. Paṭi-a 485,5: *tattha yathā loke avagantā avagato ti vuccati, evaṃ bujjhitā saccāni ti buddho; yathā paṇṇasosā vātā paṇṇasusā ti vuccanti evaṃ bodhetā pajāyā ti buddho.*

<sup>86</sup> Cf.: *yasmā vā cattāri saccāni attanā pi bujjhi, añhe pi satte bodhesi, tasmā evaṃ ādīhi kāraṇehi buddho* [Vism 209,18–20]; *yathā loke avagantā "avagato" ti vuccati, evaṃ bujjhitā saccāni ti buddho; yathā paṇṇasosā vātā "paṇṇasusā"* [cf. Ujval. ad Uṇādis II 22] *ti vuccanti, evaṃ bodhetā pajāyā ti buddho* [Pj I 15,10–13].

<sup>87</sup> It is noteworthy that Nidd is the only canonical text in which the two terms are recorded. Their formation clearly presupposes more than just basic knowledge of Pāli nominal derivation. Thus, for instance, we cannot exclude the possibility that, for example, the term *bodhetar* is coined by analogy with Sanskrit *bodhayitr*.

A past participle in *-ta* [= *cta*] is normally not used in the sense of agent *kāraka*. In Pāṇ III 4 71, however, Pāṇini lays down the semantical and syntactical conditions under which this is possible: *ādikarmaṇi ktaḥ kartari ca*: the suffix "*cta*" is also used in the sense of the agent, when it is used in the sense of an inchoative action. The Kāśikā illustrates this rule by the following example: *prakṛtaḥ kaṭaṃ devadattaḥ*: Devadatta has undertaken to make a mat. In this example the word *prakṛtaḥ* is in agreement with the agent Devadatta and is therefore, according to Pāṇinian syntactical theory, used in the sense of the agent. As shown by the example the *-ta* participle is constructed with the object *kāraka* [= *kaṭaṃ*]. We find an exact parallel to this syntactical structure in Buddhadatta's initial remarks about the meaning of "*buddha*": *catusaccadhamme* [= acc.] *buddho ... ti buddho*. There is thus no reason to doubt that his analysis presupposes Pāṇinian grammar.

In the Pāli grammatical literature we find a reflex of this analysis in Kacc [558+] 559 and Kacc-v ad loc.:

*budhagamādyatthe kattari. budha gama icc evaṃ ādīnaṃ atthe tapaccayo hoti kattari sabbakāle. yathā saṅkhatāsaṅkhatē dhamme bujjhati, abujjhi, bujjhissatī ti, buddho. saraṇaṃ gato, samathaṃ gato iccevamādi.*

[The suffix denoted *cta* is used] in the sense of the agent *kāraka*, when [the verbal root to which it is joined] has the meanings of the roots  $\sqrt{budh}$ , and  $\sqrt{gam}$ , etc.

The suffix denoted *cta* is used in all times in the sense of the agent *kāraka*, when it is joined to verbal roots that have the meaning of such roots as  $\sqrt{budh}$ , and  $\sqrt{gam}$ . For instance, [the word] *buddha*: who knows, has known and will know the dhammas that are conditioned and not conditioned. *saraṇaṃ gata*: who has found refuge, *samathaṃ gata*: who has found peace.

This analysis obviously presupposes that in Pāli — as in Sanskrit literature — one finds instances where a *-ta* participle is constructed with the accusative of goal, as in the above examples from Kacc-v. It clearly must rely on a distinctly Buddhist tradition because there is nothing in Pāṇinian grammar that justifies the interpretation of *buddha* and *gata* in this sense. Buddhapiya may have realised that Kacc departed from the tradition of

Sanskrit grammar, because he quotes the illustration of the meaning of *buddha* in Kacc-v with the remark that the *tapaccaya* is here used in the sense of the present (*ta iti vattamāne*), which, of course, reflects Pāṇinian theory (cf. Pāṇ III 2 188). In the following [Rūp 592 = Kacc 559], however, he quotes a slightly edited version of Kacc-v ad Kacc 559, with the remark that the *ta* suffix also occurs in the sense of *sabbakāla*. This clearly has no support in Pāṇinian grammar. Kaccāyana's rule may ultimately derive from a commentarial tradition connecting  $\sqrt{budh}$  and  $\sqrt{gam}$ , which can be traced back to Buddhaghosa.

In connection with the interpretation of the Buddhist stereotype *Bhagavantam saraṇam gacchāmi*, Buddhaghosa suggests taking  $\sqrt{gam}$  in the sense of  $\sqrt{budh}$ :

*yesam hi dhātūnaṃ gati attho buddhi pi tesam attho, tasmā gacchāmi ti imassa jānāmi, bujjhāmi ti ayam attho vutto* [Sv 229,22–24 = Ps I 131,4; qu. Nidd-a 442,6].<sup>88</sup>

Because (*hi*) the verbal roots that have the meaning of movement also have the meaning of understanding, (*tasmā*)<sup>89</sup> the [word] *gacchāmi* is said to have the meaning “I know”, “I recognize”.

A Sanskrit verse ascribed to a certain Rāhulapāda by Prakramabāhu II in Vism-sn 479,19–20 evidently reflects the same tradition, although it has not been possible to trace the discussion to any known Sanskrit source:

*budha ity avagamane yo dhātuḥ paripaṭhyate yatas tajjñaiḥ, gatyartha ity ato 'smāt kartary api yujyate 'yaṃ ktaḥ.*

Since (*yatas*) the verbal root  $\sqrt{budh}$  is enumerated [in the dhātupāṭha] by those who know it, in the sense of understanding (*avagamane*),<sup>90</sup> (*atas*) the *cta* suffix [= *-ta*] is also correctly used (*yujyate*), in the sense of the agent

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Paṭis-a 485,25–26: *gamanatthānaṃ dhātūnaṃ bujjhanatthattā, bujjhanatthāpi dhātuyo gamanatthā honti tasmā ...*

<sup>89</sup> *tasmā* is to be construed with *hi* [= *yasmā*].

<sup>90</sup> This is a reference to sa-Dhātup I 911: *budhā avagamane*.

[*kāraka*, i.e., in an active sense] after [the verbal root  $\sqrt{budh}$ ] when it has the meaning of movement.

It is no doubt the affinity between  $\sqrt{budh}$  as defined by *ava* +  $\sqrt{gam}$  and the fact that Pāṇini in III 4 72 ascribes an active meaning to *cta* when attached to verbs expressing movement. This may very well have suggested the particular treatment of *buddha* in the grammatical literature.

Rāhulapāda is not known from other source. His date and the nature of his work therefore remain uncertain. There is no doubt, however, that Buddhadatta has based his analysis on a similar tradition. Since there is a striking similarity between Buddhadatta's text and a text dealing with the same topic, which Aggavaṃsa quotes in Saddanīti [see below], there is reason to believe that Buddhadatta has utilised material from a Pāli source which may well be a post-Kaccāyana source.

[ ii ]

Buddhadatta's second alternative, according to which “*buddha*” has an passive value (*kamma*), would also seem to be supported by Pāṇinian grammar. In Pāṇini III 4 [69 +] 70: *tayor eva kṛtya-cta-khalarthāḥ*: [the suffixes whose meaning is denoted by] “*kṛtya* [= *-tava*, *-anīya* and *-ya*],” [the suffix whose meaning is denoted by] “*cta* [= *-ta*” and [the suffix whose meaning is denoted by] “*khal*” are only used in the sense of these two [i.e. action (= *bhāva*) and object *kāraka* (= *karma*)].

According to Pāṇinian grammatical theory, a *-ta* participle is used in the sense of the object *kāraka* when it occurs in a passive construction, in agreement with the [theoretical] object, which itself is identical with the grammatical subject of the sentence. The example used by the Kāśikā for illustrating this particular syntactical function of “*cta*” [ad loc.]: *ctaḥ karmaṇi: kṛtaḥ kaṭo bhavatā* “a mat [= *karma*] is made by you,” shows clearly the theoretical presupposition that underlies Buddhadatta's explanation: in the same way as the word *kṛtaḥ* qualifies the object *kaṭaḥ* as made by someone, the word *buddha* qualifies the object Buddha as recognised by gods and men (*devamanussehi*), and therefore it can be interpreted as the object *kāraka*.

There is reason to believe that Buddhadatta's explanation is based upon a source which was also known to Aggavaṃsa. In Saddanīti he refers to the view of certain [grammarians ?] according to whom the formation of “*buddha*” can be interpreted in terms of the object *kāraka*. In support of this

theory, he quotes a text which is almost identical with Buddhadatta's explanation. It is therefore reasonable to assume that Buddhadatta and Aggavaṃsa utilised the same source:

*keci pana kammaṇa<sup>91</sup> pi buddhasaddassa siddhiṃ icchantā evaṃ nibbacanaṃ karonti: sammāsambuddho vata so Bhagavā ti adhigatagunāvisesehi khīṇāsavehi bujjhitabbo ti buddho ti* [Sadd 482,1–4]

Some [grammarians?], however, taking the formation of the word “*buddha*” in the sense of the object [*kāraka*, i.e. in a passive sense], analyse it as follows: *buddha* means that he should be recognised (*bujjhitabbo*)<sup>92</sup> by those persons whose defilements have been annihilated and who have obtained distinctive qualities, in the words “the Bhagavan, indeed, is fully awakened”!

Unfortunately it has not been possible to trace the quotation to the work from which it was taken. It therefore remains unclear whether it is a purely grammatical source — which Aggavaṃsa's way of quoting it would indicate — or whether it is an unknown piece of canonical exegesis. If it should be the latter, it must be fairly late because Buddhadatta is the only Pāli commentator to mention it. In similar contexts in Vism, Paṭis-a, etc. we find nothing of the same nature. It probably stems from a Pāli source. If this were not the case, Aggavaṃsa surely would not have failed to identify it. It is remarkable that he does not refer to Bv-a [quoted in several places in Sadd], since he is conscientious in supporting his grammatical statements with quotations from the cts and ṭīkāś.

The last alternative would seem to be based upon an extension of the scope of Pāṇ V 2 [94+] 127: *arśa-ādibhyo 'c*: the [*taddhita*] affix *ac* [= -a] is [used in the sense of the suffix denoted *matup*, i.e. in the sense of “whose it is” or “in which or in whom it is”] after [the class of words = *ākrtigaṇa*] beginning with *arśaḥ*. We can safely assume that Buddhadatta had this particular sūtra in mind because Mahānāma, in a context where he addresses

<sup>91</sup> The reading *kammaṇa* is problematic. It might be suggested that *kamme* [loc.] is read for *kammaṇa* which is difficult to construe.

<sup>92</sup> The presence of the *krtya* form [= ger.] of *√budh* would seem to be an allusion to the Pāṇinian rule in Pāṇ II 4 70 quoted above.

the meaning and derivation of the word *buddha*, supplies us with the information necessary for identifying it. We find the text in Paṭis-a 486,20–22, which was quoted verbatim by Upasena in Nidd-a 442,33–443,2. The text reads:

*buddhi, buddhaṃ, bodho ti paryāyavacanam etaṃ. tattha yathā nilarattagunāyogā “nilo paṭo,” “ratto paṭo,” ti vuccati, evaṃ buddhigunāyogā “buddho” ti ṅāpetuṃ vuttam hoti [= Pj I 16,2–5].*

“*buddhi, buddhaṃ, bodho*” are synonyms. In that case, just as one says that a piece of cloth is blue or red on account of the blue or red quality inherent<sup>93</sup> [in it], so on account of the quality of illumination inherent [in him], the word “*buddha*” is used to denote [him as “Buddha”].

The idea is basically the same. The only difference is that this text is sufficiently explicit to identify the relevant grammatical context. Among the words included in the *ākrtigaṇa* to which Pāṇini refers, are words denoting colour (*varṇa*),<sup>94</sup> which is reflected in the two examples used by Mahānāma. The idea that the possessive suffix *matup* is deleted from words denoting colour goes back to Kātyāyana's vārttika 3 (*guṇavacanebhyo matupo luk*) on Pāṇ V 2 94.

## 2 [Bv-a 67,33–68,2]

This etymology of the word *brāhmaṇa* [< *brahma* + *√an*] is basically the same as the one that occurs in Buddhaghosa's cts. Buddhadatta has only inserted the reference to the grammarians' view to complement Buddhaghosa's explanation:<sup>95</sup>

<sup>93</sup> The term *yoga*, evidently, belongs to the philosophical context of Nyāyavaiśeṣika ontology; cf., for example, Vātsyāyana ad Nyāyasūtra II 2 61: *yogāt — kṛṣṇena rāgena yuktah śātakah kṛṣṇa ity abhidhiyate.*

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Kāśikā ad Pāṇ V 2 127.

<sup>95</sup> Cf., for example, Sp 111,12–15 = Sv 244,10 = Ps I 109,23: *brahmaṇ anatī ti brāhmaṇo, mante sajjhāyatī ti attho, idam eva hi jātibrahmaṇānaṃ niruttivacanaṃ, ariyā pana bāhitapāpattā brāhmaṇā ti vuccanti.*

*brāhmaṇo ti brahmaṇaṃ anāti ti brāhmaṇo, mante sajjhāyati ti attho. akkharacintakā pana brahmaṇo apaccamaṃ brāhmaṇo ti vadanti. ariyā pana bāhitapāpattā brāhmaṇo ti vadanti.*

*brāhmaṇa* means one who recites (*anāti*) *brahma* [= *brāhmaṇ* = the sacred scriptures, i.e., the Veda], that is, he studies the scriptures (*mante*). The grammarians, however, explain that *brāhmaṇa* means a descendant (*apaccamaṃ*) of a brahmin [= *brahmān*]. The Buddhists (*āryā*) on their side claim that he is a *brāhmaṇa* because he keeps away from sin (*bāhitapāpattā*).

It is not possible to decide which tradition the first etymology belongs to. It probably stems from the commentarial tradition of the *Aṭṭhakathācariyas*. The last one, however, has canonical precedents.<sup>96</sup> It only makes sense in a context where the actual pronunciation of the Pāli consonant cluster *br-* in *brāhmaṇa* was *b-* as recorded in the reading *bamhaṇa* of the Aśokan inscriptions. There is no problem in identifying the grammatical reference, which is to Pāṇ IV 1 [83+] 92 defining the formation of patronyms: *tasyāpatyam*: [the suffix denoted *aṇ*, etc. denotes] someone's descendant. In the present case the *vṛddhi* formation *brāhmaṇa* is covered by the scope of the suffix *aṇ*.

### 3 [Bv-a 89,16–18 ad Bv II 47]

This remark about the case syntax of the preposition *anu* can only be understood in the light of the similar analysis in Bv-a 238,32–35 [see § 6 below].

*anuyanti tathāgatan ti tathāgatassa pacchato yanti.* [so punctuate] *anuyoge sati sāmī-atthe* [so read; Ee -*attho*] *upayogavacanamaṃ hoti ti lakkhanaṃ.*

[The sentence] “They follow after the tathāgata” means they follow behind the tathāgata. When *anu* is used in composition the acc. is used in the sense of the genitive. This is the rule.

<sup>96</sup> For references, v. PED s.v. <sup>1</sup>*bāheti*.

There is no rule that justifies Buddhadatta's claim that *anu* governs the acc. in the sense of the genitive. Such a remark is absent from the analogous analysis in Bv-a 238,32–35, and one cannot therefore exclude the possibility that it stems from Buddhadatta himself. He may have based it upon the fact that *pacchato*, in the paraphrase *tathāgatassa pacchato yanti*, is to be constructed with the genitive. As it appears from the way in which the problem is formulated, Buddhadatta deals with the syntactical and semantical properties of the so-called *karmapravacanīyas* [cf. Buddhaghosa on *itthambhūtakkyāna*, q.v. supra; cf. Bv-a 238,32–35 ad Bv XX 5, q.v. infra].

### 4 [Bv-a 114,12–13]

In this case Buddhadatta deals with the well-known fact that the word *aññatra* [= Sanskrit *anyatra*] is constructed with the ablative.

*n' atthi aññatrā ti aññatralakkhanaṃ saddasatthato gahetabbaṃ. tato dasa pāramito añño buddhakāradhammo n' atthi ti attho.*

[As regards the clause] “there is no [other] except ...,” the rule concerning the word except (*aññatra*) should be sought in grammar. The meaning is that there is no other norm that creates a buddha, than the ten pāramitās.

It is not clear what rule of grammar Buddhadatta has in mind. In the Pāṇinian tradition there appears to be no explicit rule about the case with which Sanskrit *anyatra* is to be constructed. There is reason to believe, however, that Buddhadatta is thinking of Pāṇ II 3 [28+] 29: *anya- ... -yukte*, in which Pāṇini lays down the rule that a noun, when constructed with *anya*, is put in the ablative. Buddhadatta's own paraphrase [with *añña* + abl.] supports the assumption. He presumably extended the scope of the Pāṇini sūtra so as to cover the usage of *aññatra*, which is treated as a substitute form for the locative. Aggavaṃsa is apparently the only Pāli grammarian to formulate a rule for the case syntax of *aññatra*: *aññatrayoge pañcamī tatiyā ca*: the ablative and the instrumental are used in construction with *aññatra* [Sadd 703,22].

## 5 [Bv-a 173,21–24 ad Bv]

In this short remark Buddhadatta focuses on a peculiar grammatical construction where an action noun (*dassana*) is to be constructed with a nominal in the accusative:

*dassanenā pi tam buddhan ti tassa buddhassa dassanenā pi ti attho. idisesu pi sāmivacanam payojenti (Be payujj-) saddaviduno (Be saddasatthavidū).*

By seeing the Buddha: The meaning is “by the sight of the Buddha”. In such cases, however, the grammarians use the genitive.

It is not normal practice in Pāli or Sanskrit to construct an action noun with the accusative. In such a case one would normally expect the genitive (genitivus objectivus) of the nominal that is syntactically dependent on the action noun. The grammarians to whose usage Buddhadatta refers are no doubt, in this as in other cases, identical with the Pāṇinians, because Pāṇini addresses this usage in Pāṇ II 3 65: *kartṛkarmanoh kṛti*: when used with a word ending with the suffixes denoted *kṛt* [i.e. primary derivatives], [the genitive] is used in the sense of the agent [*kāraka*] or the object [*kāraka*].

## 6 [Bv-a 238,32–35 ad Bv XX 5]

In this text Buddhadatta deals with the syntactical peculiarity of the *kammapravacanīya anu*.

*tattha caturāsītisahassāni sambuddhaṃ anu pabbajjunt ti tattha anunā yogato sambuddhan ti upayogavacanam katan ti vedītabbāṃ. sambuddhassa pacchā pabbajjimsū ti attho. lakkhaṇaṃ saddasatthato gahetabbāṃ.*

In this case one should know that in the verse “eighty-four thousand who had gone forth after The fully Awakened One,” the [word] “*sambuddhaṃ*” is put in the accusative because it is constructed with “*anu*”. The meaning is “they went forth

after the Fully Awakened [had gone forth]”. The rule is to be sought in grammar.

Buddhadatta deals here — like Buddhaghosa in connection with his analysis of the verb *abhuggacchati* [v. supra] — with the linguistic category *kammapravacanīya*. Pāṇini deals specifically, in Pāṇ I 4 84: *anu lakṣaṇe*, with the usage of *anu* when used in the sense of a sign (*lakṣaṇe*). The idea is that the thing denoted by the word governed by *anu*, assumes the function of the cause of the verbal action. Consequently *anu* means “after” in a logical sense, i.e. in the sense of “as a consequence of”, or “because of.” It is, of course, debatable whether Buddhadatta is correct in assuming that *anu* has this specific force in the verse upon which he comments. However, the relatively few occurrences of the verb *anupabbajati* in Pāli would seem to suggest — in contrast to the usage of *abhuggacchati* — that we interpret *anu* in the sense of a *kammapravacanīya*, although its usage in the Pāli is not absolutely parallel to the usage defined by Pāṇini. In the Pāli it is questionable if *anu* can be treated as syntactically disjoint from the finite verb. For instance, in Vin II 180,6: *Sakyakumārā bhagavantam pabbajitam anu pabbajjanti*, it would seem to be treated as an ordinary preposition constructed with a noun in the accusative (*bhagavantam*), in agreement with an explicit not finite verb-form (*pabbajitam*). On the other hand, the Pāli grammatical literature would seem to be correct in ascribing a causal function to *anu* in this particular context: Sakyakumārā went forth after [= because] bhagavan had gone forth. Kacc-v ad Kacc 301: *kammappavacanīyayutte* uses an analogous canonical example for illustrating the rule about *kammappavacanīya*: *pabbajitam anu pabbajimsu* [= D II 30,11] = Sadd 716,13 (§ 586).

Buddhadatta noticed that the pp. *pabbajitam* was absent in Bv, and he found a justification for its absence in the grammatical literature. It is not possible to decide whether Buddhadatta relied upon a distinct Pāli grammar, but the nature of his analysis and the context in which it occurs makes it reasonable to assume that he knew Kaccāyana’s grammar and the commentarial tradition attached to it. The example chosen by the authors of the *vutti* in this particular instance is not merely a Pāli reproduction of an example taken from a Sanskrit grammar but is distinctly canonical, and its presence in Kacc-v would seem to indicate that we are dealing with a tradition which aimed at illustrating the rules of Pāli, not merely by means of Pāli translations of examples taken over directly from Sanskrit grammar, but

through genuine canonical quotations. This tendency reached its peak with Aggavaṃsa, who is claimed, by the author of the *Kaccāyanavaṇṇanā*, to have based his grammar on the Pāli.<sup>97</sup>

(to be continued)

Copenhagen

Ole Holten Pind

## PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES VII<sup>1</sup>

### FIVE PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random collection of words which are either omitted from PED,<sup>2</sup> or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there.

1. *gandhana* “harming”
2. *pāreti* “to be successful”
3. *marissa* “going to die”
4. *vivicca-sayana* “a secluded lodging”
5. *sosinna* “very wet”/*sosīna* “very cold”

1. *gandhana* “harming”

In his investigation of the phrase *vāntam āpātum* “to drink one’s vomit”,<sup>3</sup> Alsdorf mentioned the Pāli word *gandhana* found in the compound *kula-gandhana* at It 64,9:

*atijātaṃ anujātaṃ puttam icchanti paṇḍitā,  
avajātaṃ na icchanti yo hoti kula-gandhano.*

“Wise men desire a son of higher birth or equal birth; they do not desire a son of lower birth, who harms the family”.

<sup>1</sup> See K.R. Norman, “Pāli Lexicographical Studies VI”, in *JPTS*, XIII, pp. 219–27.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48 (= CPD). In addition: CDIAL = R.L. Turner, *Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*; EWA = M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*; Geiger = W. Geiger, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*; MW = Sir Monier Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*; PTS = Pāli Text Society; PED = PTS’s *Pāli-English Dictionary*; Pischel = R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*; PSM = Sheth, *Pāṭasaddamahāvaṇṇavo*; PTC = *Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance*; Pkt = Prakrit; Skt = Sanskrit; GDhp = *Gāndhārī Dharmapada*; Be = Burmese (Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana) edition; Ce = Sinhalese edition; Ee = European (PTS) edition; Se = Siamese edition; cty = commentary.

<sup>3</sup> L. Alsdorf, “Vāntam āpātum”, *Indian Linguistics*, 16, 1955, 21–28.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. *Kacc-vaṇṇ* p. 301,28–30: *Rūpasiddhikārako Candabyākaraṇanissito. Nyāsakārako Kalāpabyākaraṇanissito. Saddanūtikārako Pālinissito.*